THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION AND POWERLESSNESS

by

© KARA LYNN KLARNER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

AUGUST, 1968

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Social Participation and Powerlessness" submitted by Kara Lynn Klarner in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

Powerlessness is one aspect of the concept of alienation, and is defined as the expectation of an inability to bring about desired outcomes in regard to socio-political events. This definition stems from the Marxian view of alienation and its extension by Weber. The often-noted importance of organizational participation in the free development of human potentialities is the basis for investigating the relationship between powerlessness and several aspects of organizational participation. Chapter I gives a discussion of alienation, as a background for the consideration of powerlessness and organizational participation.

First, attention is given to the subjects' total organizational participation. Then extensity, the number of organizational memberships, and intensity, the degree of participation in each organization are considered. Participation is also classified as expressive or instrumental, according to whether the participant perceives the activities of the organization to be self-contained within the organization and satisfying in themselves or aimed at long-range goals affecting people outside the group. Attention is also given to the respondent's past record of organizational participation, his future intentions (to join new organizations or drop present ones), and his choice of the most valued current membership.

Using samples from the memberships of an evangelical church and hospital employees, mailed questionnaires were used to gather data. Chapter II describes the methodology used in obtaining and handling the data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am especially grateful for the assistance given by Professor Baha Abu-Laban, the chairman of my committee. I also thank the other members of my committee, Professors Donald E. Larsen and Robert R. Gilsdorf, for their guidance.

I express my appreciation to the following persons and their secretarial staffs for their assistance in obtaining mailing lists of persons contacted in the course of this study: Mr. Ken Dixon of the Personnel Department of the Hamilton Civic Hospitals, Mr. Douglas McIntee of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and Rev. Hudson Hilsden of the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle.

Recognition should be made of the cooperation given by the respondents.

Valuable assistance and advice were given by Miss Rosalind Beard, Dr. Karl Peter, and Dr. David A. Klarner. Franklin J. Henry, Chairman, and Mrs. Lillian Giavedoni, Research Assistant, of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, have been very helpful at many stages of preparing this Thesis. Thanks are due to Miss Emilie van Lieshout for typing the Thesis.

I express my appreciation to the Department of Sociology, University of Alberta, for financial assistance for the printing of the questionnaire and cover letters.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER IV PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

The research reported in this thesis is concerned with powerlessness, an aspect of alienation. This section will include an overview of the concept of alienation, as a background for the discussion of the relationship between powerlessness and organizational participation.

The recent literature on alienation traces the origins of this many-sided concept to Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, Durkheim and Weber, among others. The contemporary works of Merton, Fromm and Seeman on alienation are widely cited.

Hegel and Feuerbach saw alienation as a psychological characteristic.[1] Rejecting these ideas of alienation as properties of men, Marx saw alienation as "a specific property of select classes of men in factory conditions who were, as a result of these conditions, deprived of their reasons [for existence, i.e., self-fulfilling work]".[2] Hegel and Feuerbach assumed that alienation was undesireable and that people who were alienated should be integrated; but Marx, consistent with his dialectical approach, said that

> ...alienation is no better and no worse than integration, that either concept might serve positive social ends. Alienation is a driveshaft of revolution; and integration is a transitional equilibrium generating new forms of separation from the mainstream, i.e., new forms of alienation.[3]

Marx's concept of alienation, as discussed in Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts, and Durkheim's concept of anomie, as presented in Suicide, show the differing perspectives of these two thinkers.

> Anomie concentrates on barriers to the orderly functioning of society; alienation on barriers to the productive growth of individuals and by extension, barriers to the adaptive change of the social system. The non-alienated condition is not necessarily social harmony as social control, but social harmony

> as the spontaneous result of individuals being free to realize their historical potentialities. Free means autonomous and self-determining, not controlled by external forces. Alienated persons are powerless and estranged from the reified creations of their own self (social) activity.[4]

Durkheim described anomie as the condition which occurred when social constraints were ineffective for individuals in society.

> ...values are conflicting or absent, goals are not adjusted to opportunity structures or vice versa, or individuals are not adequately socialized to cultural directives...anomie is a social state of normlessness or anarchy.[5]

Man becomes alienated from his self-activity, his objects, and himself, according to Marx, when there exists "...transcendence of men's products over men so that they do not see their interests, powers, and abilities affirmed and expressed therein." The reason for this is that "Man's human and social activity is labour, and the products of labour, including society, are the extensions of man's own nature."[6]

In contrast to Marx, who focused on the alienation of wage workers within capitalistic industrialism, Weber saw this alienated condition as universal in modern society. That is: "The modern soldier is equally 'separated' from the means of violence; the scientist from the means of enquiry, and the civil servant from the means of administration."[7]

While Durkheim's notion of anomie referred to normlessness, Merton makes reference to "the inability of the social structure to provide adquately [sic] for some to achieve the goals of society."[8] Yet both have similar foci of attention. Durkheim's "anomie" referred to

> ...qualities of a group or a social structure, and not to the qualities of individuals. Similarly, Merton has indicated that his theory refers to the cultural structures, on the one hand, and the social structure, on the other.[9]

Merton, in his work on anomie, is concerned with the causes of deviant behavior which he attributes to the strong emphasis on "success" in

American society, while there is relatively little emphasis on the means of attaining "success." This leads to a "'demoralization' of the means."[10] Access to legitimate means to reach success goals is unequal; as a result, there is

> ...unequal utilization of illegitimate means...the less access to legitimate channels the greater the deviant behavior in the form of crime, delinquency, prostitution and the like.[11]

But Durkheim saw the upper classes as being most influenced by conditions of anomie; while Merton, like Marx, said that the lower classes suffered most.[12]

Seeman, in his paper "On the Meaning of Alienation", explicitly considers alienation from the social-psychological point of view. Seeman identifies five different meanings of the term "alienation." These are:

1. Powerlessness is defined as "...the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks," in regard to socio-political events.[13]

2. Meaninglessness refers to the individual's inability to "...predict with confidence the consequence of acting on a given belief."[14]

3. Normlessness is "...a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals."[15]

4. Isolation occurs when people "...assign low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in a given society."[16]

5. Self-estrangement "...refers essentially to the inability of the individual to find self-rewarding...activities that engage him."[17]

Reactions to Seeman's categorization of the meanings of alienation have been varied. Kaufman argues for the deletion of the term "alienation" from the scientific vocabulary because of its multiple interpretations.

In his view, the explanatory needs of the behavioral sciences are best fulfilled by maintaining distinctions between the dimensions of alienation,[18] as Seeman argues can be done.

Horowitz gives both positive and negative comments on formal analysis such as Seeman's. On the one hand, it is "invariably ad hoc,"[19] and in such psychological categorizations, the forms of alienation are not connected up.[20] On the positive side, however, Horowitz says:

> The main contribution of the psychological school of alienation has been to demonstrate the universality of the concept, its connection with the personality structure as well as the social structure...[21]

However, the formal, psychological approach, and the descriptive approach should not be considered mutually exclusive. That is, they should not be judged "right" or "wrong", but recognized as different ways of looking at alienation and used for what each can contribute to an explanation of social structure and process.[22]

Research on the components of alienation, as Seeman formulates them, has shown that they are somewhat independent of each other, and that they may be studied separately or in combination with others, depending on the focus of the research. Neal and Rettig give evidence for the independence of powerlessness, normlessness and Srole's anomie scale, while acknowledging that alienation can be treated as a "generalized dimension."[23]

> [The results] illustrate that different operational measures do, in some degree, relate to the general theme of alienation while contributing, at the same time, different portions of its variance. Results indicating both uni- and multidimensionality are not logically inconsistent with one another if they derive from variant orders of abstraction. In operational terms, alienation in toto is an abstract concept tying together common elements derivable from the lower-order structure.[24]

Empirical findings which justify a unidimensional approach to alien-

ation do not invalidate Neal and Rettig's finding, considering the variation in "research objectives, in assumptions about alienation, and in operational criteria."[25]

POWERLESSNESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

A number of studies have shown that an individual's sense of powerlessness is negatively related to his organizational participation, especially those which have been concerned with "mass society."

William Kornhauser sees participation in organizations as a main factor in preserving liberal democracy, which appears to be synonymous in his work with an unalienated condition. A pluralist society supports liberal democracy[26] if it has accessible elites and unavailable non-elites.

> Elites are accessible in that competition among independent groups opens many channels of communication and power. The population is unavailable in that people possess multiple commitments to diverse and autonomous groups.[27]

On the other hand, mass society exists under conditions of social atomization:

> Mass society is a situation in which an aggregate of individuals are related to one another only by way of their relation to a common authority, especially the state. That is, individuals are not directly related to one another in a variety of independent groups. A population in this condition is not insulated in any way from the ruling group, nor yet from elements within itself. For insulation requires a multiplicity of independent and often conflicting forms of association, each of which is strong enough to ward off threats to the autonomy of the individual....Social atomization engenders strong feelings of alienation and anxiety, and therefore the disposition to engage in extreme behavior to escape from these tensions.[28]

When organizations fail to develop, or when their development is excessive, the conditions for the existence of totalitarian government are provided. Also, individuals do not have a sense of participation and

control over the important, immediate aspects of their lives and communities.[29] Furthermore, it is important that there should be many organizations in a society and that individuals be associated with more than one:

> The opposition among such groups restrains one another's power, thereby limiting the aggregate intervention in elites....Furthermore, the separation of the various spheres of society--for example, separation of religion and politics--means that access to elites in one sphere does not directly affect elites in other spheres. The various authorities are more or less autonomous in their own spheres, in that they are not directly determined in their membership or policy by authorities in other spheres. These same factors protect non-elites from elites, since independent groups guard their members from one another, and since overlapping memberships among groups, <u>each of which concerns only limited aspects of its members' lives</u>, restrains each group from seeking total domination over its membership.[30]

According to Nisbet, active involvement in social organizations becomes all the more important in modern society where the government and other centralized, formal institutions assume functions previously reserved for primary groups and associations.[31] Decentralization of associations, such as labor unions and churches, to protect their autonomy and spontaneity is as urgently needed as is decentralization of the state.[32] Nisbet concludes, as does Kornhauser, that a pluralist state, along with a plurality of autonomous associations, best preserves the freedom of its members from a "monopoly of power in society."[33]

Neal and Seeman's study of the relationship between powerlessness and membership in labor or trade unions and professional and business organizations shows that organizational participation is associated with a lower feeling of powerlessness.[34] This relationship is maintained even when the controls for occupational prestige and level, age and income are introduced.[35] But the authors limit their analysis to orga-

nizations concerned with work. They do not take into account the members' intensity of participation within each organization.

In another study done in Sweden, Seeman again finds that "[work] organization membership is associated with...powerlessness...."[36] Furthermore, for work organization members who are not officers, "there is a modest but consistently negative relation between involvement in the organization and powerlessness."[37] Controls for education and other standard factors do not eliminate the relationship between powerlessness and organization.[38]

Other studies by Clark,[39] Rose,[40] Bell,[41] Mizruchi,[42] and Bell and Meier,[43] show an association between organizational participation and some variant of alienation, other than powerlessness.

Erbe studies the relations between the independent effects of socio-economic status, participation in voluntary organizations and alienation on political participation. He investigates the interrelations of alienation, socio-economic status and organizational involvement. He finds that total organizational participation, as measured by a modification of Chapin's Social Participation Scale, is negatively related to a total score of alienation, as measured by Dean's scale of powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation.[44] By analysis with complex partialling operations, Erbe finds that "alienation, as well as political participation, is an <u>effect</u> of socio-economic status and organizational involvement...."[45]

Seeman has noted that in order to obtain a useful theory relevant to mass society, three conditions must be met: first, social structural features, treated as independent variables, must be specified; second, statements must be made about the "<u>psychological effects</u> of that struc-

ture;" and, third, predictions of individual behavior must be derived.[46] This study is concerned with the first two of these aspects.

In general terms, the present study retests the frequently observed negative relationship between organizational participation and perceived powerlessness. But our effort is unique in two ways. First, attention is given to the totality of a subject's formal organizational memberships. Second, since organizational participation is a compound concept, an attempt is made to break it down to its constituent parts and, where possible, to determine the influence of one, independent of the influence of the others. Thus, in relating organizational participation to perceived powerlessness, the present study differentiates between intensity and extensity of organizational participation, and between membership in instrumental and expressive voluntary associations. Further refinement of the relationship between the two main variables includes taking account of a respondent's past record of organizational participation, his future intentions (to join new organizations or drop present ones), and his choice of the most valued current membership.

TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS

Powerlessness is an attitude which has been related to many social structural features, including organizational participation. Although the totality of organizational memberships is assumed to influence a person's belief regarding the manageability of societal events, organizations vary in the degree to which they successfully manipulate the larger social order. Thus it is reasonable to assume that members of different types of organizations might perceive varying degrees of powerlessness. Jacoby and Babchuk,[47] Jacoby,[48] and Hausknecht,[49] indicate that certain organizations may not introduce their members into full

participation in social and political life.

One classification of organizations refers to the expressive or instrumental function of the organization. The characteristics referred to seem to be related to the perception of powerlessness. Briefly, the activities of the expressive organization give immediate satisfaction and are an end in themselves, while the activities of the instrumental organization are directed outside of the organization and are a means of achieving long-range goals.

The present study classifies organizational memberships on the basis of the instrumental-expressive dimension. Investigating the most valued present membership which is classified as instrumental or expressive adds to our understanding of the impact of organizations on the respondent.

EXTENSITY AND INTENSITY OF ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

Two other contrasting aspects of organizational membership with which this study is concerned are the intensity and extensity of organizational participation, as distinguished by F. Stuart Chapin.[50] The first term refers to the degree of involvement within each organization, while the second refers to the total number or organizational memberships of each respondent. The distinction between these two aspects of participation is necessary because a higher degree of involvement within an organization is more likely to equip the individual with techniques which aid in manipulating other persons and groups,[51] or may reflect skills already possessed by the participant. Intensity of participation may be more highly related to powerlessness than the sheer number of organizational memberships. Even in expressive groups, the leaders who,

by definition, are intense participants and who act as spokesmen for the members are placed in a position of power which may influence (or reflect) their sense of control over people and events.

Finally, studying the past memberships and intentions to increase or decrease participation in the future will aid in understanding the relationship between participation and powerlessness, and will place the individual's present memberships in proper perspective. By definition (1) individuals who feel powerless percieve that there is little possibility of influencing social events, and (2) instrumental organizations provide activities which are related to solving social problems. Therefore, people who feel powerless might show little interest in joining groups for instrumental reasons. Likewise, because of their beliefs that their actions have little effect on events, the degree of social participation of some powerless people may have decreased in the past few years, and/or they may express dissatisfaction with the present memberships in acknowledging an intention to decrease their participation.

To summarize, this study investigates several aspects of participation in formal organizations which are classified according to the instrumental-expressive typology. The relationship between the participation and perception of powerlessness is studied in the light of the various dimensions of participation.

HYPOTHESES

I. Total organizational participation is negatively related to perceived powerlessness.

II. Participation in organizations with functions perceived by members as instrumental is associated with a lower degree of powerlessness than participation in organizations with functions perceived by

members as expressive.

III. Intensity of organizational participation is associated with a lower degree of powerlessness than extensity of participation.

IV. Organizational leadership[52] is negatively associated with powerlessness.

V. Persons whose current organizational participation is higher than in the past are lower on perceived powerlessness than persons whose current participation is lower than in the past.

VI. Persons who plan to increase their organizational participation are lower on perceived powerlessness than persons who plan to decrease their organizational participation.

PLAN OF THE THESIS

This chapter has been concerned with delineating the research problem and has given the theoretical basis of the problem. The next chapter will discuss the methodology used to gather and organize data. Chapters III and IV will present the data relative to the hypothesis. Chapter V will include a summary of findings, conclusions and implications of the research.

FOOTNOTES

1. Alienation, for Hegel, indicated the "separation of the object of cognition from the man of consciousness." But a person could become one with the world by knowing about it. Feuerbach said that alienation followed from seeing the material world as dreary and dismal. The psychological reactions to such perceptions were "a set of projections about a spiritual world of perfection." That is, "...one part of man is invested (properly) in the material world, and another to the world of God; the projective ideal world." To overcome alienation is to get rid of the "projective neurotic aspects of belief." Irving Horowitz, "On Alienation and the Social Order," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, XXVII (December, 1966), pp. 230-231.

2. Ibid., p. 231.

3. Ibid., pp. 231-232. See also Murray Greene, "Alienation within a Problematic of Substance and Subject," Social Research, XXXIII (Autumn, 1966), p. 373.

4. John Horton, "The Dehumanization of Anomie and Alienation," The British Journal of Sociology, XV (December, 1964), p. 286. The bases of these differing perspectives stem from the immanent interpretation of man and society of "alienation" and a transcendent interpretation of "anomie." In the former, society is seen as the extension of men. In the latter, society is seen as an entity different from and superior to individuals. Ibid., p. 289.

5. Ibid., p. 285. See also Arnold Kaufman, "On Alienation," Inquiry, VIII (Summer, 1965), pp. 159-160.

6. Horton, op. cit., p. 289. See also Horowitz, op. cit., pp. 233-234; Ernest Becker, "Mills' Social Psychology and the Great Historical Convergence on the Problem of Alienation," in Irving Horowitz (ed.), The New Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 122-126; Ephraim Mizruchi, "Alienation and Anomie: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives," in Horowitz, ibid., pp. 254-255; and T.I. Oiserman, "Alienation and the Individual," in Herbert Aptheker (ed.), Marxism and Alienation (New York: Humanities Press, 1965), pp. 143-151.

7. H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, cited in Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), p. 784.

8. Marshall B. Clinard (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior: A Discussion and Critique (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), p. v.

9. M. Clinard, "The Theoretical Implications of Anomie and Deviant Behavior," in Clinard, ibid., p. 34.

10. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, cited in E. Mizruchi, op. cit., p. 255.

11. Ibid. See also Horton, op. cit., p. 294; and Seeman, op. cit., pp. 787-788, 789.

12. Mizruchi, loc. cit. The terms "anomia" and "anomy" have been used, especially by Robert M. MacIver and David Riesman, to deal with the individual or psychological aspects of anomie. MacIver uses "anomy" to indicate "'a state of mind in which the individual's sense of social cohesion...is broken or fatally weakened.'" Robert M. MacIver, The Ramparts We Guard, cited in ibid. Reisman discusses the anomic type as a "'maladjusted' person." David Riesman, et al., The Lonely Crowd, cited in Mizruchi, loc. cit. This subjectively experienced anomia often has been studied using Leo Srole's attitude scale which measures despair, hopelessness and discouragement. Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), pp. 709-716. Clinard maintains that "alienation" is often used in reference to "the subjective aspects of what Merton called anomie." Clinard, op. cit., p. 37.

13. Seeman, op. cit., pp. 784-785. This meaning stems from the Marxian view of alienation and its extension by Weber. Use of alienation in this sense is seen in the work of C. Wright Mills, among others.

14. Ibid., p. 786. Examples of this usage are found in Adorno's work on prejudice, Cantril's analysis of social movements, Eric Hoffer's discussion of followers of mass movements, and Mannheim's discussion of "functional" and "substantial" rationality. T.W. Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950); Hadley Cantril, The Psychology of Social Movements (New York: Wiley, 1941); Eric Hoffer, The True Believer (New York: Harper, 1950); and Karl Mannheim, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction, cited in Seeman, loc. cit.

15. Seeman, op. cit., p. 788. This meaning is a derivation from Durkheim's and Merton's "anomie."

16. Ibid., p. 789. Nettler's discussion of the alienation of intellectuals contains this meaning. Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXII (December, 1957), pp. 670-677.

17. Seeman, op. cit., p. 790. This variety of alienation has been treated by Marx, Fromm, Riesman, and C. Wright Mills in the sense of being "...something less than one might ideally be if the circumstances in society were otherwise--to be insecure, given to appearances, conformist."

18. Kaufman, op. cit., pp. 163-164.

19. Horowitz, "On Alienation and the Social Order," op. cit., p. 237.

20. Ibid., p. 232.

21. Ibid., p. 233.

22. Ibid., p. 237.

23. Arthur G. Neal and Salomon Rettig, "Dimensions of Alienation among Manual and Non-Manual Workers," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (August, 1963), p. 605; and Arthur G. Neal and Salomon Rettig, "On the Multidimensionality of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXXII (February, 1967), pp. 58,60.

24. Ibid., p. 60.

25. Ibid., p. 62. Dean, Middleton, Clark and Nettler combined items in a unidimensional approach. Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXVI (October, 1961), p. 756; Russell Middleton, "Alienation, Race, and Education," American Sociological Review, XXVIII (December, 1963), p. 975; and John P. Clark, "Measuring Alienation within a Social System," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), pp. 849-852.

26. William Kornhauser, The Politics of Mass Society (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959), p. 13.

27. Ibid., pp. 40-41.

28. Ibid., p. 32. Neal and Seeman state that Kornhauser's use of "alienation" involves all of Seeman's five meanings. Arthur G. Neal and Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, XXIX (April, 1964), p. 220.

29. Kornhauser, op. cit., p. 76.

30. Ibid., p. 78. Italics in original. See also Robert A. Nisbet, Community and Power (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 246-247.

31. Nisbet, op. cit., pp. xiii, 49.

32. Ibid., p. 277.

33. Ibid., p. 284.

34. Neal and Seeman, loc. cit. Scores on Srole's anomia scale did not show such a relationship with membership. Ibid., p. 225.

35. Ibid., pp. 222-223.

36. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," The Public Opinion Quarterly, XXX (Fall, 1966), p. 358.

37. Ibid., pp. 360-361. Three separate indices of degree of participation were used, since a combination of them was not scalable: frequency of attending meetings, the importance of the organization to the respondent, and "the perceived influence that members have on organizational affairs."

38. Ibid., p. 359.

39. Clark, op. cit., pp. 849-851.

40. Arnold M. Rose, "Alienation and Participation: A Comparison of Group Leaders and the 'Mass'", American Sociological Review, XXVII (December, 1962), p. 837.

41. Wendell Bell, "Anomie, Social Isolation, and the Class Structure," Sociometry, XX (June, 1957), pp. 105-116.

42. Ephraim H. Mizruchi, "Social Structure and Anomia in a Small City," American Sociological Review, XXV (October, 1960), pp. 645-654.

43. Dorothy Meier and Wendell Bell, "Anomia and Differential Access to Life Goals," American Sociological Review, XXIV (April, 1959), pp. 189-202.

44. William Erbe, "Social Involvement and Political Activity: A Replication and Elaboration," American Sociological Review, XXIX (April, 1964), p. 207. Erbe investigated involvement in "sociable" and "issue-interest" organizations, but does not report the relationships of such participation with alienation, or any of the alienation sub-scales. Unlike many studies of organizational participation, church membership was included in the participation score. Ibid., pp. 204-205.

45. Ibid., p. 213. Italics in original.

46. Seeman, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," op. cit., p. 354. Italics in original.

47. Arthur P. Jacoby and Nicholas Babchuk, "Instrumental and Expressive Voluntary Association," Sociology and Social Research, XLVII (July, 1963), pp. 461-471.

48. Arthur P. Jacoby, "Some Correlates of Instrumental and Expressive Orientations to Associational Membership," Sociological Inquiry, XXXV (Spring, 1965), pp. 163-175.

49. Murray Hausknecht, The Joiners (New York: The Bedminster Press, 1962), p. 112.

50. F. Stuart Chapin, Experimental Design in Sociological Research (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955), pp. 276-278.

51. Rose, op. cit., pp. 835-836.

52. Leaders are defined as those respondent who indicate on the Social Participation Scale that they are (1) leaders in services or meetings or members of a committee, and/or (2) hold an office in the organization.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

THE POPULATION AND SAMPLES

For the purpose of the study, two organizations were chosen. These were the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle, Hamilton, Ontario, and the Hamilton Civic Hospitals. Selection of these organizations was based on the assumption that they include subjects who cover a range on perceived powerlessness[1] and social participation; and that there would be a similar distribution of socio-economic status in the two groups. Some of the characteristics of the members of the sample groups are presented in Appendix I.

The sample from the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle was chosen from the church mailing list which included about 450 members and non-members of varying degrees of participation. Questionnaires were mailed to all of the 250 persons identified by the church office secretary as being over 21 years of age. Of these, one questionnaire could not be delivered. The total number of useable questionnaires returned was 87, or 35% of the number sent out to church participants.

The sample from the hospital employees was chosen from persons over 21 years of age who were incumbents of occupations known to be unionized[2] in the Hamilton Civic Hospitals. The unions involved were the Civic Union of Public Employees, Local 794, and the International Union of Operating Engineers (Stationary), Local 722.

To choose the hospital employees sample, incumbents of occupations were categorized in one of seven occupational classes, according to Blishen's Socio-Economic Index.[3] An effort was made to include approximately equal numbers of males and females for each of the occupational classes. The occupations of respondents could be classified as

Classes III through VII for the males, and Classes II through VII for the females. In occupational classes where there were few incumbents, all incumbents were included in the sample. In other classes, sample members were chosen using a table of random numbers.[4] The original sample consisted of 175 men and 178 women; however, because the hospital mailing list was not kept up to date, at least 28 of these people never received the questionnaire, and at least nine had been erroneously included in the sample. Thus the actual sample numbered 316. The total number of useable questionnaires returned was 90, 28% of the total number sent to this group.

A total of 177 questionnaires were returned by members of both organizations, the response rate being approximately three out of ten.

THE PRETESTS

The first pretest was carried out between September 2 and 10, 1966. A total of thirty-three questionnaires was completed by respondents with a wide range of education, age, organizational participation and socio-economic status.[5]

Respondents were urged to comment on any difficulties which they had with questionnaire items and were asked to mark such problem items on the questionnaire, and to indicate their general reactions to the questionnaire. About one-half of the respondents were interviewed briefly and quite lengthy interviews were held with four respondents.

As a result of Pretest I, the wording of some items and instructions was simplified. The one major change which followed from the pretest was the omission of the Jacoby items[6] intended to provide instrumental-expressive scores for the respondents' most valued member-

ships. There was very little variation between the obtained scores, even though there was wide variation in the kinds of organizations being scored, and the scores might have been expected to show wide differences. Also, from comments made by two respondents, it was clear that they had not made the crucial distinction between "goals" and "activities". Another source of concern was the length and formidable appearance of the questionnaire which would have to be minimized since it was anticipated that some persons in the final sample would have low educational levels and possibly difficulties in reading and writing English. Open-ended items asking for the main reasons for the respondent's organizational participation were substituted for the Jacoby scale.

Pretest II was carried out in August 1967, when fifteen persons completed questionnaires. Respondents included nine men and six women employed by the Physical Plant Department at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario; a university student; and a university professor. Interviews were held with five of these respondents.

Only one major change was made after Pretest II. However, this stemmed from results of both Pretests I and II. The forced-choice powerlessness items had been indicated as problem areas in Pretest I by respondents in interviews and by omission of one or more of these items in twelve questionnaires. In Pretest II, five respondents similarly indicated difficulties in making choices. As a result, it was decided to present each of the parts of the forced-choice items as separate items with which the respondent could indicate his agreement or disagreement. By using this procedure, it was felt that the powerlessness score would be a more sensitive measure, since the forced-choice method sometimes

resulted in the acceptance of an item only partly agreed with.

THE INSTRUMENTS

The items included in the questionnaire can be placed in four categories. First, there are those concerned with background characteristics. The second set of items are those from which a powerlessness score is obtained; the third concerns present, past and anticipated future organizational participation, plus open-ended questions regarding the respondent's orientation to the organizations of which he is a member. Also included is the respondent's statement regarding the membership which is most important to him. The last section consists of items regarding the respondent's self-reported participation in political activities.

Background Characteristics

An important aspect of this research involves applying controls for factors which might be related to powerlessness independently of organizational participation. Information on several characteristics which might be used as controls was gathered. These characteristics are (1) sex,[7] (2) marital status, (3) age,[8] (4) birthplace, (5) length of residence in county, (6) education,[9] (7) employment status, and (8) socio-economic status.[10]

It should be noted that several studies have shown relationships between the factors discussed above and participation in organizations.[11] It seems clear that this gives further importance to the need for considering these background characteristics as control variables.

Because using each of these characteristics separately or with others as controls would be very costly of computer time, it was neces-

sary to choose one control which would be used by itself or with controls which were built into the hypotheses. Furthermore, the number of controls had to be limited because of the small number of subjects involved in the sample.

In order to determine which variables to use as controls, the initial zero-order cross-tabulation was carried out by using powerlessness as the dependent variable and the background characteristics as independent variables. For this sample, age, length of residence in Canada of the foreign-born, education and sex are significantly related to powerlessness, in that order of magnitude of relationship, in the zero-order cross-tabulation. Powerlessness and age have the highest score for Z among all of the factors tested; thus, in order to rule out the possible contaminating effects of this relationship, it is important to control for age when testing hypotheses. Where possible, this has been done.

The Powerlessness Scale

Several studies have operationalized powerlessness in terms of items which measure perception of control over socio-political events. Seeman conducted several studies using similar forms of the powerlessness scale. In his first paper reporting the use of a powerlessness scale, Seeman discussed the use of twelve forced-choice items selected from a longer scale.[12]

Some of the characteristics of the powerlessness scales used by Seeman are summarized here:

Split-half reliability	.70[13]
Test-retest coefficiency	.93[14]
Guttman reproducibility coefficient	.87[15]

Neal and Rettig used similar powerlessness items related to political and economic events.[16] In a second paper, Neal and Rettig use the same scale items except one, which has been replaced with a new item, without explanation.[17]

The powerlessness scale used in this thesis derives from Neal and Rettig's 1963 paper, with only a few minor changes in wording and the addition of the second half of one of their items which they apparently omitted accidentally. Three main reasons can be given for using this scale: (1) Seeman reported consistently adequate reliability for this and other scales composed of similar items; (2) similar scales had been used in many studies; and (3) all of the items were presented in Neal and Rettig's paper, while in most of the other sources, only examples of items were given.

Neal and Seeman derived scores for the seven forced-choice items (chosen from the twelve Neal and Rettig items) by giving a score of one for each response which indicated powerlessness and a score of zero for each response which indicated a lack of powerlessness. Thus, the total score could have values from zero to seven.[18]

The format and scoring of Neal and Rettig's twelve items was changed in this study. The paired items from the forced-choice format were positive and negative forms of the same statement. In this study, rather than asking subjects to indicate the one part of each of the twelve paired items with which they most agree, they were asked to respond to each of the twenty-four parts of the scale by "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree."

Scoring of the Powerlessness Items

The responses of the subjects on the powerlessness items were treated

as ordinal data; that is, the possible responses to each item were dichotomized as "high" or "low" powerlessness, with the scoring on half the items being reversed to take into account their negative natures. A total score for each respondent derived from the number of high powerlessness responses. The total scores obtained ranged from one to twenty-one, with a median of ten and a mode of seven. The median of the distribution was used to dichotomize these scores into "high" (eleven to twenty-one) and "low" (one to ten) powerlessness scores.

Discriminating Power of the Powerlessness Items

To determine the discriminating power of the items, a comparison of the percentage of respondents who were in the highest and lowest quartiles[19] of the ordered distribution of powerlessness scores who gave high powerlessness responses to each of the twenty-four items was carried out. To determine whether the differences in percentages were significant, Z was computed. All of the items were found to discriminate between respondents with the highest and lowest total scores at the .05 level of significance.

Scalogram Analysis

The responses to the twenty-four powerlessness items, dichotomized as "high" or "low", were tested for unidimensionality to determine to what extent they constituted a Guttman scale.[20] Using the Cornell technique for counting scale errors, a coefficient of reproducibility (CR) of .75 was obtained; by using the Goodenough technique, CR = .71. The value of the minimal marginal reproducibility (MMR) for the twenty-four items was .66. Using the definition of perfect scale types cited

by Edwards,[21] it was ascertained that only three subjects gave such a pattern of responses to the powerlessness items.

Since the CR's obtained for the twenty-four powerlessness items were below the figure suggested as constituting evidence for unidimensionality, further investigation was carried out to determine if the CR and MMR of any sub-set of the twenty-four items would obtain more acceptable levels. Using the Cornell method, the CR for the ten items with the lowest number of errors was .83, while MMR = .75. Likewise, using larger sub-sets of items did not improve the evidence for scalability, since the value of MMR increased with the value of CR.

Split-Half Reliability

The reliability of the powerlessness items was investigated by the split-half method, in which r = .66.

Validity of the Powerlessness Items

The questionnaire included nine questions on participation in political activities which were intended as a validity check for the powerlessness scale. That is, since the powerlessness scale is concerned with the individual's perception of control over economic and political events in society, it might follow that a person with high powerlessness would show an associated lack of political activity.

Many studies have shown a negative relationship between different aspects of alienation and political participation. Erbe's study shows this correlation; in addition, he lists similar findings in eight other studies.[22]

The political participation items used here were developed by Woodward and Roper[23] and later modified by Erbe. These items were de-

veloped to identify active and less active participants with respect to national political issues. Five areas constitute the Woodward-Roper operational definition of political activity:

> (1) voting at the polls, (2) supporting possible pressure groups by being a member of them, (3) personally communicating directly with legislators, (4) participating in political party activity and thus acquiring a claim on legislators and (5) engaging in habitual dissemination of political opinions through word-of-mouth communications to other citizens.[24]

Woodward and Roper point out that their scale "seems to have a good deal of 'face validity' as a measure of citizen political activity" and noted that the questions could be answered easily and without apparent exaggeration by people of all educational levels and political persuasions.[25]

Erbe attempted to counteract any unreliability stemming from exaggeration involved in such self-reported data by treating the scores as ordinal data; that is, "high," "medium," and "low" political participation.[26] Similar considerations in this research have led to grouping the obtained numerical scores as "high" and "low", with the median as the cutting point.[27]

In Erbe's study, a Woodward-Roper item dealing with membership in organizations which were politically oriented was omitted because he treated this aspect elsewhere. Erbe also increased the score given to informal political discussion.[28] These changes were also incorporated into this study. A Woodward-Roper item which Erbe omitted was included here; it concerns attendance at political meetings in the last four years (score one for "yes," zero for "no"). Two items were added which appeared in neither the Woodward-Roper nor the Erbe studies. They

concern writing "letters to the editor" of newspapers, magzines or professional journals (score one for "yes," zero for "no") and participating in a public protest, march or demonstration (score one for "yes," zero for "no"). Otherwise, Erbe's scoring was used. Thus the total political participation score could vary from zero to fourteen.

In order to test the validity of the powerlessness items, the relationship between political participation and powerlessness was investigated.[29] The zero-order relation, that is, the relationship of the variables with no control factors, is negative, but statistically non-significant. That is, the majority of respondents having low political participation have high powerlessness and the majority of those having high political participation have low powerlessness.

The relationship between powerlessness and political participation also was examined with various factors controlled. When age is controlled, the youngest and oldest age groups show negative relationships, with the former being statistically significant. There was no relationship shown for the middle age group.

The results obtained when controlling for (1) age and total organizational participation, (2) extensity and intensity of organizational participation, and (3) expressive and instrumental organizational participation are inconsistent in direction of relationship and almost always non-significant.

In conclusion, the data concerned with the validity of the powerlessness items suggest that for some control categories there is a somewhat consistent negative relationship between powerlessness and political participation. However, this does not constitute acceptable evidence of

validity, since the results are largely statistically non-significant.

Organizational Participation

Several items were used in this study to investigate aspects of organizational participation. The first of these was Chapin's "Social Participation Scale, 1952 Edition."[30]

Chapin's scale was used, with some modification, to deal with the respondents' present organizational memberships. Some of the main characteristics of Chapin's scale follow. Participation in clubs, lodges, business, political, professional, or religious organizations and labor unions are included, whether local or not. Sub-groups within these organizations, if they are independent bodies, are also included. Membership (score one point for each), meeting attendance (score two), making financial contribution (score three), membership in committees (score four) and office holding (score five) are investigated for each organization. The total number of memberships gives an extensity score, while the last four aspects give a measure of intensity of participation.

Changes made in the Social Participation Scale for use in this study are discussed below. In general, these alterations were made with the expectation that a more complete picture of total participation would be obtained.

(1) Since the questionnaire was self-administered, types of organizations were listed, with examples, leaving spaces under each type for listing participation. This practice hopefully eliminated ambiguity about what organizations to list and was intended as a memory aid for respondents.

(2) Participation in an organization, rather than membership, is given a score of one point.

(3) Frequency of meeting attendance was taken into account. Scores in this section were zero for "never attend," two for "sometimes attend," and three for "almost always attend."

(4) Rather than indicating whether they made contributions, respondents were asked, "Do you give anything besides dues?" A "no" response received no score, while a "yes" response was given a score of four.

(5) Respondents were asked if they were leaders in services or meetings or a member of a committee. No score was given for "no"; "yes" scored five.

(6) A respondent who indicated that he was an officer received a score of six.

For convenience, the following two questions were used within the format of the modified Chapin scale:

(A) For each organization, respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had been a member or attended meetings. This item was coded separately for length of membership in the organization judged by the respondent as most important.

(B) In order to classify the respondents' expressive-instrumental orientation toward each membership, they were asked to report the main reasons for their participation. The subjects' orientation to organizational memberships were judged as expressive or instrumental on the basis of the Babchuk and Gordon typology which is summarized here:

> 1) The member of the expressive association achieves immediate and continuing gratification from taking part in the organization's activities. The instrumental association member may even find the group's activities distasteful, but he will get satisfaction from the knowledge that they help to accomplish certain long-range goals. In other words, personal gratification from participation in the group's activities is more remote (in terms of time) for the member of the instrumental group than for the member of the expressive group.

2) The activities of the instrumental association tend to be externally oriented, whereas those of the expressive association are focused inward. Expressive organizations 'perform a function primarily for the individual participants through activities which are confined and self-contained within the organization....In contrast, the major function and orientation of the instrumental organization are related to activities which take place outside the organization.'

3) Activities by members of expressive associations represent ends in themselves, while instrumental association members see participation in the group's activities as a means of accomplishing external, long-range goals.[31]

Items were included to ascertain the respondent's current, in relation to past, organizational participation. If applicable, the subject was asked why and in what organizations his participation had decreased. He was also requested to give his main reason(s) for participating in the organization in the past, which was classified as instrumental, expressive, or instrumental-expressive.

Intentions to join new organizations and to drop present memberships and reasons for such intentions were investigated. The responses of subjects who indicated interest in joining new organizations were categorized using the instrumental-expressive typology.

Organizational Participation Scores

The raw scores obtained using the modified Chapin Social Participation Scale and the subjects' responses regarding their orientations to each organization were used to derive raw subscores for extensity and intensity of participation in several types of organizations: (i) score of extensity and (ii) intensity in organizations for which expressive reasons for membership are given; (iii) score of extensity and (iv) intensity in organizations for which instrumental reasons for membership are given; (v) score of extensity and (vi) intensity in organizations

for which both instrumental and expressive reasons for membership are given; (vii) score of extensity and (viii) intensity in organizations in which membership is said to be compulsory;[32] and (ix) score of extensity and (x) intensity in organizations in which reasons for membership are not given or are unclassifiable.

Then, as in any process of index construction, a decision had to be made about the most appropriate use of these raw sub-scores in deriving the final sub-scores and the total organizational participation score. Deciding on an operational definition, that is, the number of categories and where to establish cutting points is always more or less arbitrary. Blalock says the following about operational definitions:

> Since all measurement involves classification as a minimal requirement, an operational definition can be considered to be a detailed set of instructions enabling us to classify individuals unambiguously....The definition should be sufficiently precise that all persons using the procedure will achieve the same results.[33]

In the following operational definitions given for each of the ten sub-scores and the total organizational participation score, this requirement is met.

The raw scores from which the standardized scores were derived are included here:

Extensity in expressive organizations	0 - 6
Intensity in expressive organizations	0 - 52
Extensity in instrumental organizations	0 - 7
Intensity in instrumental organizations	0 - 72
Extensity in mixed organizations	0 - 3
Intensity in mixed organizations	0 - 36
Extensity in compulsory organizations	0 - 2
Intensity in compulsory organizations	0 - 7
Extensity in unclassifiable organizations	0 - 5
Intensity in unclassifiable organizations	0 - 20

A cutting point for each of the ten sub-scores was established, giving

"high" and "low" scores. The mean of the frequency distribution of the scores was used as the upper bound for the "low" category because it was found that in several of these ten raw sub-scores, most of the respondents had no participation. For these scores, the median would have been zero. However, using the mean as the cut-off point allowed more people with what, subjectively, seemed to be low participation to be classified as "low."

The justification for carrying out such standardization of the raw sub-scores into "low" and "high" sub-scores at this point in the manipulation of the data rests on the characteristics of the data. It was assumed that a higher score on each of the ten sub-scores indicated a greater amount of participation than did a lower score. That is, it seemed to be justifiable to consider these data as ordinal, but not interval in nature. However, "...when we translate order relations into mathematical operations, we cannot, in general, use the usual operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. We can, however, use the operations 'greater than' and 'less than' if these prove useful."[34]

To derive a measure of total organizational participation, the decision was made that each of the ten sub-scores should have equal weight. Since the intention was to determine if total organizational participation or extensity or intensity in certain kinds of organizations was more relevant to powerlessness, any other weighing procedure would prejudice the results. A total organizational participation score of "low" or "high" is obtained by dichotomizing the frequency distribution of scores obtained from the number of "high" scores for each of the ten sub-scores. Various combinations of the sub-scores give measures, similarly obtained,

of "low" and "high" extensity; intensity; and total participation in expressive (including participation in organizations judged as expressive, expressive-instrumental, and compulsory) and instrumental organizations.[35]

While the rounding error from such a procedure may have been greater than would have occurred in a more complex standardization operation, this did not seem serious enough to offset the advantage of the simplicity of the operation, even if the data were appropriate for algebraic manipulation.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

The questionnaire, with a cover letter and a stamped, addressed return envelope, was sent by mail to each person in the sample. Each questionnaire was given a code number so that follow-ups could be made. The cover letter stressed that responses were completely confidential. This, if accepted by the respondent, provided a situation conducive to candid responses.

On the third day after mailing the questionnaires, a reminder postcard was mailed to each person in the sample. On the sixteenth day after mailing the questionnaires, an additional follow-up postcard was sent to non-respondents.[36]

Many questionnaires were returned because of wrong addresses. Extreme efforts were made to obtain correct addresses from the telephone book, city directory, and telephone information service. In many cases, three mailings were necessary. Follow-up cards also were sent on the third and sixteenth days for these "problem" cases.

Incomplete items on the returned questionnaires were remailed to respondents with a letter[37] and a stamped, addressed return envelope,

requesting that they be completed. One-half of sixty-nine respondents returned such items.

THE COMPUTER PROGRAMMES AND STATISTICS

Each subject's responses on biographical and other items and the standardized scores were coded and punched on IBM cards. Programmes for the scoring and standardization, discriminating power and the split-half reliability of the powerlessness items, and the scoring and standardization of the organizational participation measures were written by Dr. Franklin Henry to meet the requirements of this study.

Existing programmes, also written by Dr. Henry, were used for obtaining the distribution of responses for each item (Programme MARGE) and for the cross-tabulations (Programme CRSTAB). All programs were run on the IBM 7040 computer.

> CRSTAB is a general programme for the discovery of relationships among sociological variables....
>
> Programme CRSTAB calculates frequencies, totals, percentages, averages and chi squares. V's, rank order and Pearsonian correlation are calculated and tested for significance.
>
> Systematic consideration is given to the possibility of the existence of non-monotonic relationships and to the possibility of reversal of relationships within categories of the control variables.[38]

The measure of association chosen as most appropriate in this study is Spearman's rank order correlation (SP). SP is designed for correlating two ordinal scales and can be used if there are ties in rankings. This procedure involves comparing the rankings of each respondent on two sets of scores.[39]

When control factors are introduced into the cross-tabulations of Programme CRSTAB, the degree of correlation for each partial table is

expressed as SP, and Z of SP is noted. In addition, a pooled or average SP and Z of SP is computed. This average SP can be a useful measure of association of "...the average relationship within categories of the control variable(s) when we pool results."[40] However, such an average is meaningful only when the statistics are roughly the same size and the direction of the relationship between the variables is the same for all partial tables.

In this study, Z is used to indicate whether the relationships between powerlessness and the several independent variables are a result of influences such as random response variability; random errors of measurement, classification and tabulation; and random "forces" affecting observed outcomes.[41]

When SP is computed for each cross-tabulation, relationships obtained when the order of the categories of the independent variable is permuted are noted. The chosen SP is usually that obtained when the order is 1, 2, 3, as coded. When some different order of categories gives an SP with a substantial improvement in the amount of relationship, that SP is chosen. Where SP 213 or 132 is chosen, this will be noted.

Some explanation should be given of the procedure mentioned above regarding the "reversal of relationship within categories of the control variables." In Programme CRSTAB, S1 and S2 refer to the pooled SP obtained when there is a reversal of the direction of relationship(s) within some or all of the partial tables concerned with the first or (if there are two) second control variables, respectively.

The chosen SP or pooled SP which is computed in Programme CRSTAB is chosen from S0 (the average SP), S1 and S2. In most cases the chosen SP

is SO, unless S1 or S2 have values which show a substantial improvement in the amount of explained relationship. Where S1 or S2 is the chosen SP, this will be noted.

This chapter has been concerned with a discussion of the means of studying the problem described in Chapter I. In the next two chapters the results of this research will be presented.

FOOTNOTES

1. Quinney found that "...political alienation is associated with low social status and high religious fundamentalism, and ... fatalism is associated with low social status and high religious fundamentalism." Respondents were politically alienated if they gave two appropriate answers to the following questions: "Do you feel that a few persons or families really control politics in this county?","Do you think that most of your county elections are honest?", and "Do you think that most of your county officials are honest?" Fatalism referred to the perception "that events and one's destiny are fixed in advance and little can be done to cause any changes." Richard Quinney, "Political Conservatism, Alienation, and Fatalism: Contingencies of Social Status and Religious Fundamentalism," Sociometry, XXVII (September, 1966), pp. 372-381.

The minister and the minister of education of the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle characterized this church as evangelical. Such a church is oriented to the personal salvation of its participants. According to the minister, greater emphasis is placed on full participation in the activities of this church by the whole family than on formal membership. In order to become a member, one must be over twelve years of age, be "saved," agree with the religious doctrines of the church and agree to rigorous adherence to norms of tithing. With these factors in mind, it might be expected that the congregation would regard participation in this church as most important and have few other intensive organizational ties.

2. All persons employed more than 20 hours a week in these occupations must join the union and become "unsigned" members. By paying small additional dues each year, the employee may become a "signed" member. No effort was made to differentiate "signed" and "unsigned" members. It was the opinion of Mr. Douglas McEntee, business manager of the Canadian Union of Public Employees that there would be few differences in attitudes or behavior between the two types of members. Most became "signed" members so that they could participate in the CUPE Christmas party.

All persons who were paid on a daily rate, worked part-time, were on call, sick relief or vacation relief were omitted from the sample since it was probable that they were not union members.

3. Bernard Blishen, "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXIV (November, 1958), pp. 519-531.

4. The class distribution of the sample is as follows:

	Men		Women	
	Sample	Total number from which sample taken	Sample	Total number from which sample taken
Class II	0	0	2	2
Class III	18	18	38	86
Class IV	7	7	41	119
Class V	18	18	5	5
Class VI	71	109	46	158
Class VII	61	64	46	168
Total N	175	216	178	538

5. Respondents included seventeen participants of two spiritualist cults, ten employees of the University of Alberta library, three university students, two skilled workers, and one high school teacher.

6. Jacoby, op. cit., p. 169.

7. Seeman found comparable results on powerlessness for men and women university students in Sweden. It is possible that the unique situation of women in a university may not rule out the expectation that powerlessness is sex-related. Melvin Seeman, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning," Sociometry, XXX (June, 1967), p. 114.

8. Dean found a significant relationship between age and powerlessness. Dean, op. cit., p. 757.

9. Dean finds significant relations between powerlessness and education. However, Seeman notes that controlling for education does not eliminate the relationship between organizational membership and powerlessness. Dean, loc. cit.; and Seeman, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," op. cit., pp. 358-359.

10. There are conflicting results on the relation between socio-economic status and powerlessness. Dean showed a significant negative relationship between powerlessness and occupation. Erbe lists in a footnote eight additional studies, besides his own, which show that alienation or anomia are highly related to socio-economic status. But Neal and Rettig say, "Our own data suggest that one should neither assume that men who occupy positions of power feel powerful, nor that men who lack power by objective criteria feel powerless." Dean, loc. cit.; Erbe, op. cit., p. 200; and Neal and Rettig, "On the Multidimensionality of Alienation," op. cit., p. 63.

However, Neal and Seeman showed that workers who did not belong to work organizations obtained higher powerlessness scores than organized workers, regardless of occupational status. Seeman reported similar results. Neal and Seeman, loc. cit.; and Seeman, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," loc. cit.

The respondents' occupations were classified according to Blishen's

Socio-Economic Index. Blishen constructed the 1961 index for 320 occupations listed in the 1961 Canadian census by calculating scores from the "percentage of males in each occupation whose income was reported to be $5,000 or over during the preceding 12 month period and the percentage who had attended at least the fourth year of high school." These scores were standardized, with the weights being determined by the scores calculated by Pineo and Porter in their index of occupational social standing for 88 comparable occupations found in both lists. Bernard R. Blishen, "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada," The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, IV (February, 1967), pp. 41-53; and Peter C. Pineo and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada," The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, IV (February, 1967), pp. 24-40.

The next step in classifying occupations was to split the distribution into three categories, using a rough approximation of the normal curve to establish the two cut-off points.

11. a. Sex and membership. John C. Scott, Jr., "Membership and Participation in Voluntary Associations," American Sociological Review, XXII (June, 1957), p. 320.

b. Marital status and membership. Charles R. Wright and Herbert H. Hyman, "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys," American Sociological Review, XXIII (June, 1958), p. 292; and Scott, op. cit., p. 322.

c. Age and membership. Scott, op. cit., p. 320; and Basil G. Zimmer and Amos H. Hawley, "The Significance of Membership in Associations," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (September, 1959), p. 198.

d. Length of residence and membership. Scott, op. cit., pp. 322-323; Zimmer and Hawley, op. cit., p. 199; Basil G. Zimmer, "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), p. 219; Wright and Hyman, op. cit., p. 291; H.W. Beers and C. Heflin, "The Urban Status of Rural Migrants," Social Forces, XXIII (October, 1944), p. 36.

e. Education and membership. Scott, op. cit., p. 320; and Zimmer and Hawley, op. cit., p. 198.

f. Occupational status and membership. Wright and Hyman, op. cit., p. 288; Scott, op. cit., p. 322; and Zimmer and Hawley, loc. cit..

12. Melvin Seeman and John W. Evans, "Alienation and Social Learning in a Hospital Setting," American Sociological Review, XXVII (December, 1962), pp. 774-775. The characteristics of the longer scale, developed mainly by S. Liverant, on which item analyses and comparison with criterion variables have been carried out, have been reported in several M.A. and Ph.D. studies at Ohio State.

13. Ibid., p. 775. "...this figure is probably an under-estimate of the scale's general reliability. This judgment rests on the fact that somewhat longer versions of the same scale have been used, in a variety of studies involving both community and college samples, yielding uniformly satisfactory reliabilities."

14. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," op. cit., pp. 357-358. Factor analysis showed a "clear general factor for fifteen powerlessness items" in the Swedish sample.

15. Ibid.; see also Neal and Seeman, op. cit., pp. 218-219.

16. Neal and Rettig, "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers," op. cit., p. 602.

17. Neal and Rettig, "On the Multidimensionality of Alienation," op. cit., p. 56.

18. The seven items used to compute the powerlessness score were chosen after testing for scalability. Neal and Seeman, loc. cit.; scoring obtained from correspondence with Melvin Seeman.

19. The percentage of cases in each of the highest and lowest groups was approximately 25%. Because ties existed for most powerlessness scores, the number of cases included up to the score chosen as cut-off point could only approximate 25%.

20. Allen L. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 172-199.

21. Ibid., pp. 193-197.

22. Erbe, op. cit., pp. 206, 200. See also A. Campbell, et al., The Voter Decides (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1954), pp. 194-195.

23. Julian L. Woodward and Elmo Roper, "Political Activity of American Citizens," in H. Eulau, S. Eldersveld and M. Janowitz,(eds.), Political Behavior (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956), pp. 133-137.

24. Ibid., p. 133.

25. However, the authors note that the percentages of people reporting high frequency of voting are larger than those found in other studies, and guessed that the other frequencies might also be somewhat inflated. Ibid., pp. 133-134.

26. Erbe, op. cit., pp. 202-203.

27. Woodward and Roper justified combination of scores on separate items into a single score on the basis of cross-tabulations of each item against every other. All of the questions had high positive inter-correlations, but "none of the inter-correlations was so high as to lead to the conclusion that any two questions were measuring nearly the same thing." Woodward and Roper, loc. cit.

28. Erbe, op. cit., p. 202.

29. See Appendix III.

30. Chapin, loc. cit.

Evidence on the reliability of the Social Participation Scale, given by Chapin, is as follows: (1) Test-retest (a) with a one-week interval for a sample of university students, showed r= .887; and (b) with an interval of several months for a sample of slum families, r= .887. (2) A reliability test of internal consistency between corrected and the original score weights showed r= .97. F. Stuart Chapin, "Social Participation and Social Intelligence," American Sociological Review, IV (April, 1939), p. 159.

Chapin also gives evidence of the scale's validity. He says that this scale is logically valid since it is concerned with "actually observed forms of social participation." In addition, considering organizational participation as an index of social status, Chapin investigated correlations with external criteria of status. He found positive relationships. Additional evidence of validity is given by the results of studies of the organizational participation of differing groups of respondents which showed differences in scores, as might logically be expected, e.g., between upper middle class and slum families. Ibid., pp. 160-162.

31. Jacoby, op. cit., p. 164.

32. Scores in categories 5 to 8 were combined with the expressive categories on the basis of the following distribution of powerlessness scores:

Powerlessness Score	Number of respondents who have only participation in this type of group			
	Expressive	Instrumental	Expressive-instrumental	Compulsory
1		1		
2				
3				
4	2	1	1	
5				
6	3			1
7	5	1		1
8	2			
9	1	1		1
10	2		1	1
11	4	1		1
12	5			
13	5	1		2
14	2	1	1	1
15	1		1	1
16			1	
17				2
18	2			
19		1		
20	1			
21				
Total N	35	8	5	11
Median	11	10	14	13
Mean	10.69	9.75	11.8	12

33. Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Social Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), p. 9.

34. Ibid., p. 14.

35. Respondents whose participation could not be classified were omitted in the analysis of (1) total participation, (2) intensity and

(3) extensity in expressive or instrumental organizations.

36. Robert C. Nichols and Mary Alice Meyer, "Timing Postcard Follow-Ups in Mail-Questionnaire Surveys," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXX (Summer, 1966), pp. 306-307. The authors found that groups which received postcard reminders had a higher response rate than groups which received no reminders. The highest response rate was achieved by a combination of the three-day postcard and either a sixteen-day or twenty-seven-day follow-up postcard.

37. See Appendix II.

38. Franklin J. Henry, "Programme CRSTAB," (unpublished paper, Hamilton, Ontario: Department of Sociology, McMaster University), p. 1.

39. Blalock, op. cit., p. 317. While SP is intended for use with ordinal data, it can also be used with quasi-ordinal data. In this study, in order to obtain comparable results, SP is used throughout. It has been necessary to assume, in some cases, that certain nominal categories involve greater or lesser advantage in regard to powerlessness.

40. Ibid., p. 239. Italics in original.

41. H. Costner, "Statistical Inference," (unpublished paper, Seattle: Department of Sociology, University of Washington), pp. 14-16.

CHAPTER III

THE RESULTS: PART I

This chapter contains a report of the data used to test Hypotheses I through IV, which are concerned with current organizational participation and powerlessness. Chapter IV will include a discussion of findings on powerlessness and (1) current participation compared to past participation and (2) anticipated future participation.

The procedure followed for testing the hypotheses is as follows: first, the relationship between powerlessness and the various organizational variables is investigated with no statistical controls; second, this relationship is examined with age and/or certain other important factors held constant.

TOTAL ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION AND POWERLESSNESS

Hypothesis I states: "Total organizational participation is negatively related to perceived powerlessness." The data used to test this hypothesis are presented in Tables 3:1 and 3:2.

Table 3:1 shows that the findings are in the predicted direction, but the magnitude of the correlation is small and not statistically significant at the .05 level. Table 3:2, which introduces age as a control variable, also indicates that the findings are in the predicted direction for the youngest and oldest age groups, but, again, the results are not statistically significant. For the middle age group, the correlation is positive and very small (SP = .04).

It can be concluded that the findings give partial support to Hypothesis I, since the non-significant negative relationships for the

Table 3:1 Total Organizational Participation and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Total organizational participation: High	Low	Total
High	42	52	49
Low	58	48	51
Total N	43	132	175

SP = -.08, Z of SP = -1.10

Table 3:2 Total Organizational Participation and Powerlessness, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Total organizational participation: High	Low	Total
	21 to 29 years old		
High	30	40	38
Low	70	60	63
Total N	10	30	40
	SP = -.09, Z of SP = -.56		
	30 to 49 years old		
High	43	39	41
Low	57	61	59
Total N	23	56	79
	SP = .04, Z of SP = .34		
	50 years old and over		
High	50	74	70
Low	50	26	30
Total N	10	46	56
	SP = -.20, Z of SP = -1.48		

youngest and oldest groups suggest that total organizational participation might be meaningful in predicting powerlessness for some age groups.

It is evident from Table 3:2 that the majority of the respondents in the two youngest groups have low powerlessness regardless of the degree of total organizational participation. An explanation of this finding may lie in other factors which have not been studied here. For example, the meaning of participation for the younger age groups may be different from the meaning which the older age group attaches to it. Also, the degree of organizational participation in the younger age groups may be influenced by certain demands on their time (e.g., informal social activities, young families and establishing careers) which do not apply to the older age group.

This lends support to what Erbe calls the "selection theory" of organizational participation. That is,

> ...organizations recruit selectively from the class of high social participators in general. Regardless of class or background, or the nature or context of the organization, these people simply get around more, and are more interested in other people and other aspects of life...[1]

A second explanation of the results which seems to apply to all three age groups derives from the "socialization theory:"

> ...when individuals come in contact with more highly educated persons, who have travelled about the world more, and who have examined their own and others' thoughts more, they are exposed to new ideas and new role models, and they acquire new skills, new knowledge and new confidence... [However, this] theory assumes some selection of the high participators who create the context in which low participators are converted.[2]

Erbe further notes that "These two processes doubtless occur simultaneously."[3]

Another explanation of these results which should be acknowledged

here is the nature of the samples studied. That is, because all respondents are participants in at least one organization, perhaps the contrast is less well-defined between low and high participants than it would be if non-participants were included in the sample.

QUALITY OF ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION AND POWERLESSNESS

Hypothesis II predicts, "Participation in organizations with functions perceived by members as instrumental is associated with a lower degree of powerlessness than participation in organizations with functions perceived by members as expressive." The data examined to test this hypothesis are presented in Tables 3:3 to 3:6.

Table 3:3 presents information on the relationship of powerlessness and participation in organizations judged as instrumental, controlling for participation in organizations judged as expressive. The relationships for both parts of this table are low and non-significant, but negative, as predicted. That is, low participation in organizations judged as instrumental is more likely to be associated with high powerlessness.

When, as in Table 3:4, participation in groups judged as expressive is investigated, with participation in groups judged as instrumental held constant, the relationships between expressive participation and powerlessness are nearly the same for both low and high instrumental participation. The relationships are negative, as predicted, with that for low instrumental participation being statistically significant at the .05 level, and that for high instrumental participation being nearly significant at that level.

Because of the difficulty of controlling simultaneously for certain

Table 3:3 Instrumental Organizational Participation and Powerlessness, by Expressive Participation (Percentage Distribution)

	High Expressive Participation			Low Expressive Participation		
	Instrumental Participation			Instrumental Participation		
Powerlessness	High	Low	Total	High	Low	Total
High	33	37	37	49	60	56
Low	67	63	63	51	40	44
Total N	6	27	33	45	72	117
	SP = -.02			SP = -.11		
	Z of SP = -.16			Z of SP = -1.14		
	Pooled SP = -.07, Z of SP = -.79					

Table 3:4 Expressive Organizational Participation and Powerlessness, by Instrumental Participation (Percentage Distribution)

	High Instrumental Participation			Low Instrumental Participation		
	Expressive Participation			Expressive Participation		
Powerlessness	High	Low	Total	High	Low	Total
High	33	49	47	37	60	54
Low	67	51	53	63	40	46
Total N	6	45	51	27	72	99
	SP = -.22			SP = -.20		
	Z of SP = -1.55			Z of SP = -2.00*		
	Pooled SP = -.21, Z of SP = -2.54*					

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

background factors, these findings indicate only tentatively that participation in groups judged as expressive is more highly related to powerlessness than participation in groups judged as instrumental. That is, regardless of the degree of instrumental participation, expressive participation shows significant and "near-significant" negative relationships with powerlessness. However, instrumental participation is shown to have very small relationships to powerlessness when expressive participation is controlled.

In summary, participation in groups judged as expressive is shown to be related to feelings of ability to achieve desired social outcomes. Perhaps the low powerlessness scores are related to the satisfactions of expressive participation which carry over to feelings of being able to affect what happens in society at large. Alternatively, some people who feel that they weild social power are selectively recruited to such organizations. That is, they feel that they could effect changes, if necessary, but until the need seems urgent, if then, the effort of direct social action is deferred and the more immediate gratifications are sought in expressive participation.

In addition to the materials presented above, the data concerned with the most valued organization can shed further light on the relationship between powerlessness and quality of organizational participation. If, as in Hypothesis II, participation in organizations with perceived instrumental functions is associated with a lower degree of powerlessness than participation in organizations with perceived expressive functions, then one might expect that the quality of the organization which the respondent choses as most important would be related to powerless-

ness. Tables 3:5 and 3:6 present data concerned with the most important organization.

Table 3:5 shows the relationship between powerlessness and memberships judged as expressive, expressive-instrumental or instrumental, when they are chosen as most important. There is a small negative relationship which is statistically non-significant. When age is controlled, as in Table 3:6, for the youngest group, contrary to prediction, there is a small and non-significant positive relationship; in the middle age group, there is a small negative and non-significant correlation. A large and statistically significant negative relationship is shown for the oldest group.

Hypothesis II must be rejected. When the degree of the respondent's expressive and instrumental participation is considered, the evidence suggests that participation in groups with perceived expressive functions for its members, and not instrumental, is more highly related to powerlessness. However, when the type of the respondent's most valued organization is taken into account, inconsistent results are obtained. The middle and oldest age groups show predicted relationships between powerlessness and type of most important organization. This suggests that for some age groups, when the importance of the organization is taken into account, instrumental participation may be more relevant to feelings of powerlessness than expressive participation. However, in the youngest groups, respondents are more likely to have low powerlessness, regardless of the type of most important organization. Investigation should be carried out to determine what factors may be related to the powerlessness of young adults which are not equally important for the oldest group.

Table 3:5 Type of Organization Chosen as Most Important and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Instrumental	Expressive-instrumental	Expressive	Total
High	43	41	52	48
Low	57	59	48	52
Total N	23	37	85	145

SP = -.09, Z of SP = -1.08

Table 3:6 Type of Organization Chosen as Most Important and Powerlessness, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Instrumental	Expressive-instrumental	Expressive	Total
	21 to 29 years old			
High	40	40	38	39
Low	60	60	62	61
Total N	5	5	21	31
	SP = .02, Z of SP = .10			
	30 to 49 years old			
High	25	36	41	38
Low	75	64	59	62
Total N	22	8	41	71
	SP = -.10, Z of SP = -.90			
	50 years old and over			
High	60	50	83	70
Low	40	50	17	30
Total N	10	10	23	43
	SP = -.26, Z of SP = -1.73*			

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Consider the possible relationship of stages of the life-cycle to organizational participation. Perhaps the participation of individuals in the older age groups is more closely related to their personal needs and attitudes than is the participation of persons in the younger age groups. That is, perhaps the organizational activity or lack of activity of older persons is less likely to be inconsistent with the behavior one would expect, given certain more or less stable attitudes.

THE EXTENSITY AND INTENSITY OF PARTICIPATION AND POWERLESSNESS

Hypothesis III is concerned with extensity and intensity of organizational participation. It states: "Intensity of organizational participation is associated with a lower degree of powerlessness than extensity of participation." Tables 3:7 and 3:8 contain the data used to test this hypothesis. The relationships between powerlessness and intensity or extensity of organizational participation, controlling for extensity and intensity, respectively, are investigated.

In the low extensity control category of Table 3:7, intensity is shown to be related to powerlessness in the predicted direction, with a small negative, non-significant correlation. However, for the high extensity control category, there is a small positive, non-significant relationship between intensity and powerlessness.

Table 3:8 shows nearly the same results for the relationship between extensity and powerlessness, but the negative correlation for the low intensity control category is large and significant at the .05 level.

On the basis of this evidence, Hypothesis III must be rejected. Intensity of participation, as in Table 3:7, does not show a greater

Table 3:7 Intensity of Participation and Powerlessness, by Extensity of Participation (Percentage Distribution)

	High Extensity			Low Extensity		
	Intensity			Intensity		
Powerlessness	High	Low	Total	High	Low	Total
High	42	35	38	33	59	56
Low	58	65	62	67	41	42
Total N	38	40	78	6	91	97
	SP = .07			SP = -.12		
	Z of SP = .61			Z of SP = -1.22		

Table 3:8 Extensity of Participation and Powerlessness, by Intensity of Participation (Percentage Distribution)

	High Intensity			Low Intensity		
	Extensity			Extensity		
Powerlessness	High	Low	Total	High	Low	Total
High	42	33	40	35	59	52
Low	58	67	60	65	41	48
Total N	38	6	44	40	91	131
	SP = .06			SP = -.22		
	Z of SP = .39			Z of SP = -2.55*		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

negative correlation with powerlessness than does extensity of participation. However, it should be noted that there is a larger percentage of low powerlessness scores for the high intensity than in the low intensity partial tables in Table 3:8. This seems to indicate that intensity is relevant to powerlessness when considered with extensity.

An explanation is needed for the inconsistent findings of Tables 3:7 and 3:8. Before any conclusions can be based on such relationships, however, it is necessary to control for factors shown to be related to powerlessness, and type of organization.

Assuming that the powerlessness and organizational participation measures are reliable and valid, the following explanations of these results are suggested. Perhaps some respondents with membership in many organizations, but who do not participate very intensely in each organization, still obtain the benefits of such organizations in reference to feelings of ability to determine social outcomes. Alternatively, it is possible that people who have low powerlessness join many organizations, but their need to be "involved" is satisfied by minimal participation in them. It is also possible that circumstantial reasons prevent some of them from participating more intensely.

Considering respondents who have highly intense participation in few organizations, one explanation which could be given to explain their preponderantly lower scores of powerlessness is that they, unlike respondents who participate little in many organizations, are more realistic about how much time they can give to such activities. Because of their intense participation, it may be assumed that the satisfactions are also intense, again leading to the possibility that such personal satisfac-

tions may be generalized to larger social spheres as feelings of power. Alternatively, the selection theory of participation might explain such findings. Again this points up the need to investigate powerlessness and intensity and extensity by type of organizational participation.

ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POWERLESSNESS

Hypothesis IV states that "Organizational leadership is negatively associated with powerlessness." Tables 3:9 and 3:10 are concerned with the relationship between powerlessness and members categorized as non-leaders and leaders.

The results in Table 3:9 show a moderately large, significant negative relationship between powerlessness and leadership. The majority of non-leaders have high powerlessness, while the majority of leaders have low powerlessness.

When age is controlled, as in Table 3:10, all three age groups show the predicted negative relationships, which vary in size from a small, non-significant relationship for the youngest group; to a moderate, non-significant relationship for the middle age group; to one which is large and significant for the oldest group.

Additional data are presented here to investigate further the relationship between leadership and powerlessness, and the question of expressive-instrumental participation and powerlessness. Tables 3:11 and 3:12 are concerned with leaders in organizations for which they give expressive[4] or instrumental[5] reasons for participation.

In Table 3:11, the zero-order correlation, the relationship is not in the expected direction. There is a positive relationship, with the leaders of groups with expressive functions for participants being more

Table 3:9 Organizational Leadership and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Leaders	Non-Leaders	Total
High	38	55	49
Low	62	45	51
Total N	63	112	175
	SP = -.17, Z of SP = -2.19*		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table 3:10 Organizational Leadership and Powerlessness by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Leaders	Non-Leaders	Total
		21 to 29 years old	
High	33	40	38
Low	67	60	63
Total N	15	25	40
	SP = -.06, Z of SP = -.41		
		30 to 49 years old	
High	32	46	41
Low	68	54	59
Total N	31	48	79
	SP = -.14, Z of SP = -1.20		
		50 years old and over	
High	53	77	70
Low	47	23	30
Total N	17	39	56
	SP = -.24, Z of SP = -1.78*		
	Pooled SP = -.24, Z of SP = -1.78*		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table 3:11 Expressive or Instrumental Group Leaders and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Type of group led: Instrumental	Expressive	Total
High	52	33	38
Low	48	67	62
Total N	17	46	63
	SP = .19, Z of SP = 1.50		

Table 3:12 Expressive or Instrumental Group Leaders and Powerlessness, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Type of group led: Instrumental	Expressive	Total
	21 to 29 years old		
High	50	27	33
Low	50	73	67
Total N	4	11	15
	SP = .21, Z of SP = .80		
	30 to 49 years old		
High	57	25	32
Low	43	75	68
Total N	7	24	31
	SP = .29, Z of SP = 1.57		
	50 years old and over		
High	50	55	53
Low	50	45	47
Total N	6	11	17
	SP = -.04, Z of SP = -.17		

likely to score low on powerlessness. Leaders of groups with instrumental functions are nearly equally likely to score low and high on powerlessness. This relationship is not statistically significant.

The relationships are inconsistent when age is controlled, as Table 3:12 shows. For the youngest and middle age groups, there are non-significant positive correlations. The relationship for the oldest group is negative and statistically not significant.

On the basis of Tables 3:9 and 3:10, Hypothesis IV is accepted. That is, when there are no controls or when age is held constant, the relationships between powerlessness and leadership are negative, as predicted. However, only for the oldest group was there a statistically significant relationship.

Table 3:11 shows, contrary to expectation, that more leaders of groups with expressive meanings have low powerlessness than do leaders of groups with instrumental meanings. When age is controlled, the same relationships are observed for the two youngest groups. But for the oldest group, a slightly higher proportion of the leaders of groups with instrumental meanings have low powerlessness compared to leaders of organizations with expressive meanings. These results must be interpreted with caution since these relationships are not statistically significant. These results may indicate that the experience of leadership, with its associated opportunity to manipulate events, in groups which offer expressive rewards may be generalized to feelings of power in regard to societal events. Alternatively, it is possible that persons who feel more powerful generally are more likely to become leaders of such groups, where attitudes related to powerlessness are less likely to be put to

the test of bringing about changes that are the goals of instrumental groups.

This chapter has reported data relevant to Hypotheses I through IV. The conclusions reached are as follows: Hypothesis I, regarding total organizational participation and powerlessness, is rejected; Hypothesis II, which is concerned with the quality of organizational participation and powerlessness, is also rejected; Hypothesis III, related to the degree of participation and powerlessness, likewise, is rejected; but Hypothesis IV, regarding leadership and powerlessness, is accepted.

The next chapter is concerned with powerlessness and current, compared to past, participation and anticipated future organizational participation.

FOOTNOTES

1. Erbe, op. cit., p. 214.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. This category included leaders of expressive and/or expressive-instrumental groups.

5. This category includes leaders of instrumental groups, with or without other types of led groups.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS: PART II

This chapter contains data relevant to the last two hypotheses which are concerned with powerlessness and current, compared to past, participation and anticipated future organizational participation.

PAST PARTICIPATION

Hypothesis V states: "Persons whose current organizational participation is higher than in the past are lower on perceived powerlessness than persons whose current participation is lower than in the past." That is, current, as compared to past participation, is negatively related to powerlessness.

Tables 4:1 and 4:2 present data to test this hypothesis. Table 4:1 shows that there is, as predicted, a small, negative,but non-significant relationship between powerlessness and current, compared to past, participation. However, when age is controlled, there is variation in this relationship. There is a moderate negative, but non-significant relationship for the youngest group; a small, non-significant negative relationship for the middle age group; and a small, non-significant positive relationship for the oldest group.

Table 4:1 Current Organizational Participation Relative to Past Participation and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

	Current Participation Compared to Past		
Powerlessness	More than in Past	Less than in Past	Total
High	38	52	46
Low	62	48	54
Total N	39	56	95
	SP = -.12, Z of SP = -1.16		

Table 4:2 Current Organizational Participation Relative to Past Participation and Powerlessness, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

	Current Participation Compared to Past		
Powerlessness	More than in Past	Less than in Past	Total
	21 to 29 years old		
High	25	47	37
Low	75	53	63
Total N	12	15	27
	SP = -.22, Z of SP = -1.12		
	30 to 49 years old		
High	35	40	37
Low	65	60	63
Total N	20	20	40
	SP = -.06, Z of SP = -.37		
	50 years old and over		
High	71	67	68
Low	29	33	32
Total N	7	21	28
	SP = .04, Z of SP = .21		

Hypothesis V must be rejected, although the findings do suggest that past participation may be related to powerlessness for some age groups. The data for the two youngest groups, but not for the oldest group, lends support to the socialization theory of organizational participation mentioned in Chapter III.

In Table 4:3 the relationship between powerlessness and current, compared to past, organizational participation is further explored, controlling for extensity and intensity of participation. As expected, there are large, but non-significant, negative relationships between current, compared to past, participation and powerlessness for respondents with (1) low extensity and low intensity, and (2) high extensity and high intensity. For the high extensity, low intensity control category, there is a moderate, non-significant positive relationship. The low extensity, high intensity control category has a large non-significant positive association, but this result is unreliable because of the small number of cases involved.

Before any meaningful interpretation of these results could be made, it would be necessary to control for factors shown to be related to powerlessness. In addition, interpretation of these data can only be tentative since most of the correlations are statistically non-significant and may be a result of random fluctuations. In the following discussion it is assumed that the powerlessness scale gives reliable and valid results.

Table 4:3 Current Organizational Participation Relative to Past Participation and Powerlessness, by Extensity and Intensity of Participation (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Current Participation Compared to Past: More than in Past	Less than in Past	Total
	Low extensity, low intensity		
High	46	67	60
Low	54	33	40
Total N	13	27	40
	SP = -.20, Z of SP = -1.22		
	High extensity, low intensity		
High	56	38	44
Low	44	63	56
Total N	9	16	25
	SP = .17, Z of SP = .85		
	Low extensity, high intensity		
High	33	0	25
Low	67	100	75
Total N	3	1	4
	SP = .50, Z of SP = .87		
	High extensity, high intensity		
High	21	42	30
Low	79	58	70
Total N	14	12	26
	SP = -.22, Z of SP = -1.09		

Although both the (1) low extensity, low intensity and (2) high extensity, high intensity control categories exhibit the expected relationships between present, compared to past, participation, the percentage of respondents scoring low on powerlessness is much larger for the most active participants. This lends support to the idea that the degrees of participation are important factors related to powerlessness.

Perhaps the high powerlessness and current increased participation of respondents who participate very little in many organizations shows that they are seeking in a more or less random way for solutions to unacceptable personal or social conditions which may be related to feelings of powerlessness. The low intensive participation of these people may reflect dissatisfaction with the solutions offered by the organizations. On the other hand, their lack of intensive participation may be a result of circumstantial factors.

Consider the low powerlessness of respondents who have little intensive participation but who belong to several organizations and whose current participation has decreased. Perhaps these respondents dropped out of or decreased their participation in organizations which did not provide satisfactions. The impact of their present memberships, though they do not participate intensely, may be as important in regard to their feelings of being able to control social events as more intensive participation.

Unfortunately, there are too few cases in the category for respondents with a great deal of participation in very few organizations to suggest any reliable interpretation of the results.

Reasons for Decreased Participation and Powerlessness

In order to investigate more thoroughly the relationship between powerlessness and organizational participation which has decreased in the present, relative to the past, the reasons given by respondents for such a decrease have been investigated. It is anticipated that persons who have decreased their participation because of dissatisfaction with the organization will have higher powerlessness than those whose participation decreased because of circumstantial reasons, such as illness or moving. Tables 4:4 and 4:5 give the relevant data.

Table 4:4 presents data in which it can be seen that there is almost no relationship between powerlessness and the reasons participation decreased.

When age is controlled, the results are non-significant. For the two youngest groups, the relationships are moderately large and small, respectively, and are negative, as predicted. For the oldest group, there is a moderately large, non-significant positive relationship.

Table 4:4 The Reason Current Organizational Participation Has Decreased and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Reason current participation has decreased		
	Circumstances	Dissatisfaction	Total
High	49	50	49
Low	51	50	51
Total N	39	10	49
	SP = -.01, Z of SP = -.69		

Table 4:5 The Reason Current Organizational Participation Has Decreased and Powerlessness, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Reason current participation has decreased		
	Circumstances	Dissatisfaction	Total
	21 to 29 years old		
High	41	66	47
Low	59	33	53
Total N	12	3	15
	SP = -.20, Z of SP = -.74		
	30 to 49 years old		
High	33	40	36
Low	66	60	64
Total N	12	5	17
	SP = -.06, Z of SP = -.24		
	50 years old and over		
High	66	50	65
Low	33	50	35
Total N	15	2	17
	SP = .21, Z of SP = .84		

Perhaps for the oldest age group, the circumstantial reasons for decreasing participation are related to "old age" itself, which has been shown to be associated with high powerlessness. Since most respondents in the younger age groups have low powerlessness, this seems to indicate that, for most of these respondents, the "circumstantial" reasons given are not masking other reasons for decreased participation which might be related to high powerlessness.

Reasons for Decreased Participation, Type of Organization and Powerlessness

Another aspect of decreased participation investigated here, by which it is hoped to increase our understanding of powerlessness, is the type of organization in which participation has decreased, when the decrease has occurred because of dissatisfaction with the organization(s).[1] It might be expected that such a decrease in participation in organizations with instrumental functions for members would be more likely to be associated with high powerlessness than a decrease in participation in organizations with expressive functions.

In Table 4:6, contrary to prediction, there is a moderately large, but non-significant negative relationship between powerlessness and type of organization in which the respondent's participation decreased because of dissatisfaction. It is interesting to note that there is a significant negative association between powerlessness and type of organization in which participation has decreased for circumstantial reasons, while it might be expected that there would be no relationship. Because of the small number of cases involved, these results may not be reliable. However, this relationship should be studied further using controls for degree and type of present participation.

Table 4:6 Type of Organization in Which Current Participation Has Decreased and Powerlessness, by the Reason for the Decrease (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Organization in which participation decreased: Instrumental	Expressive and/or expressive-instrumental	Total
	Dissatisfaction		
High	33	58	50
Low	66	42	50
Total N	3	7	10
	SP = -.30, Z of SP = -.90		
	Circumstances		
High	16	54	48
Low	84	46	52
Total N	6	29	35
	SP = -.29, Z of SP = -1.69*		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

To summarize, the zero-order correlation in Table 4:1 shows the predicted relationship between current, compared to past, participation and powerlessness. However, it is shown in Table 4:2 that only for the two youngest age groups is the predicted relationship obtained. In spite of the degree of present, compared to past participation, subjects in the oldest group have relatively similar high probabilities of having high powerlessness. It is possible that for the oldest group, present or future participation and/or other factors are more relevant to powerlessness than past participation.

Recall that in Table 3:2 for the oldest group there is a fairly high negative relationship between powerlessness and total organizational participation. In fact, this correlation is higher for the oldest age group than for the youngest two groups. Likewise, the negative relationship between powerlessness and type of organization chosen as most important is higher (and significant) for the oldest group than the relationships for the other age groups. The same phenomena occur for powerlessness and leadership, both when non-leaders and leaders and when type of led groups are considered. In addition, powerlessness and intentions to increase or decrease organizational participation are more highly related for the oldest group than for the others.

Further investigation was carried out to enhance our understanding of powerlessness and current, compared to past, organizational participation. Inconsistent and non-significant relationships between powerlessness and current, compared to past, participation are obtained when extensity and intensity of participation are controlled. Only respondents with high extensity and high intensity or with low extensity and low in-

tensity show the expected relationship.

Studying respondents whose participation had decreased, when the reasons for such a decrease are investigated, it is shown that only the two youngest groups have the expected relationships, which are statistically non-significant. When the type of organization in which participation has decreased because of dissatisfaction is investigated, contrary to prediction, a large, but non-significant negative relationship is obtained. However, this investigation omits inquiry into the type and degree of current participation which would have to be carried out before these results could be accepted with confidence.

FUTURE PARTICIPATION

Hypothesis VI involves a comparison of the powerlessness of persons who plan to increase or decrease their organizational participation. It is hypothesized that the former will have lower powerlessness than the latter.[2] Tables 4:7 and 4:8 are concerned with this hypothesis.

The zero-order correlation, shown in Table 4:7, shows the predicted negative, significant result. These negative relationships are maintained, although they are non-significant, when age is controlled. These results must be accepted with caution because of the small number of cases involved. It should be noted that the averaged association of these three tables is statistically significant.

It is interesting to note that nearly one-half of the respondents intending to decrease their participation are in the oldest group. As is discussed below, three of these explicitly give "old age" as the reason for the intended decrease.

Reasons for Intended Decrease in Participation

To further investigate the relationship between powerlessness and

Table 4:7 Intentions to Increase or Decrease Organizational Participation and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Plan to Increase Organizational Participation	Plan to Decrease Organizational Participation	Total
High	35	73	44
Low	65	27	56
Total N	34	11	45
	SP = -.41, Z of SP = -2.71*		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table 4:8 Intentions to Increase or Decrease Organizational Participation and Powerlessness, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Plan to Increase Organizational Participation	Plan to Decrease Organizational Participation	Total
	21 to 29 years old		
High	33	50	36
Low	67	50	64
Total N	9	2	11
	SP = -.13, Z of SP = -.41		
	30 to 49 years old		
High	26	50	30
Low	74	50	70
Total N	19	4	23
	SP = -.19, Z of SP = -.91		
	50 years old and over		
High	67	100	82
Low	33	0	18
Total N	6	5	11
	SP = -.43, Z of SP = -1.36		
	Pooled SP = -.25, Z of SP = -1.65*		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table 4:9 Reasons for Intended Decrease in Organizational Participation and Powerlessness

	Considering Decreasing Participation					
	Yes				No	Total
Powerlessness	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction	Circumstances Old Age	Circumstances Lack of Time		
High	2	1	3	1	63	70
Low	0	0	0	4	74	78
Total N	2	1	3	5	137	148

intentions to decrease participation, the reasons given for the intended decrease are investigated. Table 4:9 presents data on the distribution of powerlessness scores for respondents not intending to decrease participation and for the eleven respondents intending to decrease their participation, noting the reasons for such intentions. Clearly, there are not enough respondents anticipating a decrease in participation for reasons of dissatisfaction to test the prediction that powerlessness is related to the reason for such an intention. However, this meagre data is suggestive because the single subject who gives reasons of dissatisfaction has high powerlessness, while all of those intending to decrease their participation because of old age, or who do not give sufficient information to classify the reason, have high powerlessness.

Type of Organization Interested in Joining

Additional evidence intended to shed light on the association of powerlessness and intentions to join certain types of organizations is presented in Tables 4:10 and 4:11. This data is concerned with the relationship between powerlessness and interest in joining groups for instrumental or expressive reasons. It is anticipated that more of those intending to join organizations for instrumental reasons will have low powerlessness than those who intend to join groups for expressive reasons.

Contrary to expectation, Table 4:10 shows a moderately large, non-significant negative relationship between powerlessness and intentions to join groups for instrumental or expressive reasons. The majority of respondents interested in joining organizations, regardless of type, have low powerlessness.

Table 4:10 Type of Reason Given for Expressed Interest in Joining Organization(s) and Powerlessness (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Type of reason given		
	Expressive	Instrumental	Total
High	25	44	34
Low	75	56	66
Total N	16	16	32
	SP = -.20, Z of SP = -1.10		

Table 4:11 Type of Reason Given for Expressed Interest in Joining Organization(s) and Powerlessness, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Type of reason given		
	Expressive	Instrumental	Total
	21 to 29 years old		
High	40	33	38
Low	60	67	63
Total N	5	3	8
	SP = .07, Z of SP = .18		
	30 to 49 years old		
High	0	36	22
Low	100	64	78
Total N	7	11	18
	SP = -.43, Z of SP = -1.76*		
	50 years old and over		
High	50	100	67
Low	50	0	33
Total N	4	2	6
	SP = -.50, Z of SP = -1.12		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

It is possible that people with low powerlessness who are interested in joining organizations for expressive reasons want the personal satisfactions given by these organizations and are not compelled to achieve social changes. As for respondents who are interested in joining organizations for instrumental reasons, the majority, likewise, have low powerlessness, although a larger percentage have high powerlessness than in the expressive category. Perhaps this indicates that persons who are interested in joining organizations for instrumental reasons who have high powerlessness, are motivated by an effort to overcome a felt lack of power. It is conceivable that a respondent who has knowledge of the means of weilding power to bring about desired social change believes that change is possible, but because of his own inactivity does not see himself as an agent of change, and therefore feels powerless.

As shown in Table 4:11, when age is controlled, the directions of the relationships are inconsistent. There is a small non-significant positive relationship for the youngest group and large negative correlations for the middle and oldest categories, that for the middle age group being significant. Again, because of the small number of cases, these results should be accepted with caution.

To summarize the results regarding the powerlessness of persons intending to decrease or increase their future organizational participation, recall that the predicted relationships are confirmed by the data presented in Tables 4:7 and 4:8. Therefore, this hypothesis can be accepted, although caution is called for because of the small number of cases involved.

Although there are few cases on which to base judgement of

Hypothesis VI it has been noted that all respondents intending to decrease their participation, with the exception of most of those who give reasons of a lack of time, have high powerlessness. In addition, most of those not intending to decrease their participation have low powerlessness. These results give further evidence that there is some relationship between participation in organizations and feelings of being able to put into effect desired social outcomes.

Some explanation should be sought for the results obtained in relation to powerlessness and type of organization in which the respondent has indicated his interest in joining. First of all, perhaps such intentions do not reflect feelings of powerlessness, but rather a desire to "round out" the respondent's organizational participation by joining groups which will give different satisfactions than those in which they now participate. Therefore, in order to explain such results, it would be necessary, at least, to control for type and extent of current participation. Perhaps the values of certain sub-groups in society concerning activity in various groups and social responsibility are involved here, remaining unrelated to feelings of what can be done to bring about changes in society.

This chapter has included discussion of the hypotheses concerned with powerlessness and past participation, and intentions regarding future organizational participation. It has been concluded that Hypothesis V, which is concerned with current, compared to past, participation, and powerlessness, must be rejected. However, Hypothesis VI, involving intentions to decrease participation in any organization or to join additional organizations, is accepted.

The final chapter will summarize the findings, draw conclusions and discuss the implications of the results.

FOOTNOTES

1. There were so many categories possible, if participation in more than one organization had decreased, that coding had to be devised which would contain a small number of alternatives. The following code has been used:

a. If instrumental participation decreased because of dissatisfaction and any other type of participation decreased because of dissatisfaction or circumstances, the classification is instrumental, dissatisfaction.

b. If expressive participation and/or expressive-instrumental participation decreased because of dissatisfaction and instrumental participation decreased because of circumstances, the classification is expressive, dissatisfaction.

c. If expressive and/or expressive-instrumental participation decreased because of dissatisfaction and expressive and/or expressive-instrumental participation decreased because of circumstances, the classification is expressive, dissatisfaction.

d. If expressive and/or expressive-instrumental participation decreased because of circumstances, the classification is expressive, circumstances.

e. If expressive, expressive-instrumental and/or instrumental participation decreased because of circumstances, the classification is instrumental, circumstances.

2. These categories are not mutually exclusive, as investigated in this study. (See items 38 and 40 of the questionnaire in Appendix II.) Since hypotheses should be concerned with mutually exclusive phenomenon, in any future investigation, these items should be combined to obtain the respondent's future intentions regarding overall participation. In this study, in fact, three subjects indicated that they intended both to decrease their participation in some organization(s) and that they were considering joining additional groups. Because of the small number of cases involved, the percentage distributions obtained (in Tables 4:7 and 4:8) when these three cases were omitted were recomputed, as follows:

Table 4:7 a

Powerlessness	Plan to Increase...	Plan to Decrease...
High	32	75
Low	68	25
Total N	31	8

Table 4:8 a

Powerlessness	Plan to Increase...	Plan to Decrease...
	21 to 29 years old	
High	33	50
Low	67	50
Total N	9	2
	30 to 49 years old	
High	23	50
Low	77	50
Total N	17	2
	50 years old and over	
High	60	100
Low	40	0
Total N	5	4

Dropping out these cases does not appreciably change the percentage distributions. It seems clear that the correlations maintain the same directions and lack of statistical significance.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The goal of the reseach reported in this thesis is to investigate the relationship between powerlessness and various aspects of organizational participation. Total organizational participation, extensity and intensity of participation are differentiated. Participation in expressive and instrumental groups is investigated. Other aspects studied for their relationships with powerlessness are (1) the type of most important organization, (2) leadership, (3) the degree of past, compared to present, participation, and (4) future intentions regarding increasing or decreasing participation.

The main findings in this study are as follows:

(1) Total organizational participation is related in the expected way to powerlessness only for the youngest and oldest age groups.

(2) Participation in organizations with functions perceived by members to be expressive is more highly related to powerlessness than participation in organizations with perceived instrumental functions. However, when the type of most important organization is considered, high participation in groups with perceived instrumental functions is more likely than expressive participation to be related to low powerlessness for the middle and oldest age groups.

(3) Neither extensity nor intensity of participation is found to be consistently related to powerlessness, although there is a statistically significant negative relationship for low or high extensity and low intensity.

(4) Organizational leadership is related to powerlessness, but

leaders of groups with perceived expressive functions, contrary to expectation, are more likely than leaders of instrumental groups to have low powerlessness.

(5) Current, compared to past, organizational participation is related to powerlessness, as predicted, but only for the two youngest groups.

(6) Intentions regarding future participation are found to be related, as predicted, to powerlessness, but, contrary to prediction, respondents who are interested in joining organizations for expressive reasons are more likely to have low powerlessness than those who are interested in joining organizations for instrumental reasons.

CRITIQUE OF THE POWERLESSNESS SCALE

In previous studies, the powerlessness scale has been used in a forced-choice format and scores have been treated as interval data. These procedures seem questionable. That is, answers given to forced-choice items which may not accurately reflect the respondents' attitudes are treated as if fine distinctions had been and could be made in the degree of powerlessness shown. These difficulties were hopefully overcome in this study, since subjects were asked to respond to each part of the previously forced-choice paired items and responses were treated as ordinal data.

On the other hand, the results concerning the scalability, reliability and validity of the powerlessness items point to this aspect of the study as a problem area. First, considering unidimensionality, even though there is some evidence that the powerlessness items measure <u>an</u> attitude,[1] on the contrary, the findings related to scalability suggest that more than one attitude is being examined in

the powerlessness scale. There is insufficient evidence to determine whether the powerlessness items used here are more or less scalable than when the forced-choice format is used. Since the probability of getting perfect scale types increases as the number of items decreases, the higher coefficient of reproducibility reported by Seeman[2] would be expected. However, Seeman has not reported minimal marginal reproducibility which would be needed to compare the reproducibility of the two methods.

The split-half reliability of the powerlessness items, as noted in Chapter II, is quite low. In many cases, scores on the first half of the powerlessness items were higher than on the second half. It is possible that (1) the format for presenting the powerlessness items contributed to the differences in total scores for the two halves, or that (2) the content of the items in the first half is such that the higher scores would have been obtained using any format of presentation. It would be necessary to systematically vary the format of the attitude questions to decide which of the two explanations is the more probable.

In regard to the validity of the powerlessness scores, it should be recalled that even though some of the results were in the predicted direction, it was concluded that there was insufficient evidence for the validity of the powerlessness items. The expected relationship between political participation and powerlessness is maintained only for the youngest and oldest groups when age is controlled. Perhaps some unexplored age-related characteristics, such as the relative lack of leisure time and increased absorption with young families and establishing careers, are related to political participation

independent of feelings of powerlessness.

Dean suggests explanations which might be relevant here to explain the relatively large percentages of high powerlessness found among high political participants.

> It may be that Adorno is correct in suggesting that the alienated individual 'personalizes' politics. That is to say, if the alienated person sees complex political and socio-economic issues in terms of 'good' or 'bad,' 'strong' or 'weak' leaders, he might well be an active participant in politics.[3]

Other possibilities mentionned by Dean are that powerlessness might lead to "'frantic political activity, as an escape from the self;'"[4] and that alienated people who vote, "vote against the 'powers that be.'"[5] Perhaps this might also be true of the other kinds of political participation investigated here.

Finally, the general lack of acceptance of the hypotheses regarding the relationship of organizational participation and powerlessness may indicate that the powerlessness scale is not effective in studying relevant aspects of feelings of being able to affect social change. In addition, perhaps respondents who have low powerlessness, in fact, do not feel that they themselves can effect desired outcomes in society, but that other people or even God can accomplish change.[6] The responses given by many church members, although not systematically studied to determine how many felt this way, gave indications of such attitudes. This points to the need for a powerlessness instrument which would differentiate among these attitudes.

COMPARISON OF MEASURES OF ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

This study is unique in its investigation of powerlessness and (1) extensity and intensity and (2) expressive and instrumental participa-

tion. Consideration should be given now to the question of which of the organizational participation measures (total, extensity, intensity, instrumental or expressive participation) gives the best prediction of powerlessness.

The hypothesized relationship between powerlessness and total organizational participation was not found for all age groups. The results concerning extensity and intensity indicate that, as studied here, variations in these aspects of participation are not consistently related to powerlessness. However, consistent results concerning the relationship between powerlessness and expressive participation, considered in several different contexts, is an important finding. It has been shown that participation perceived by respondents as having instrumental functions, when expressive participation is controlled, has low negative non-significant relationships with powerlessness. However, expressive participation, when instrumental participation is controlled, has moderately large, significant and near-significant negative relationships with powerlessness.

Comparing the results for the several measures of organizational participation used here, it appears that expressive participation is most relevant for predicting powerlessness. That is, the type of function served by the organization seems to be more highly related to powerlessness than either the total amount of participation, the number of groups with which the respondent is affiliated, or the extent to which he is actively involved in organizational activities.

Investigating the type of most highly valued organization and powerlessness adds some qualifications to the finding that of all of the organizational measures, participation with perceived expressive

functions is most highly related to powerlessness. That is, the expected negative relationships are shown for the middle and oldest age groups, the latter being statistically significant. A large majority of respondents in the oldest group who chose organizations with perceived expressive functions as most important, have high powerlessness, while small percentages are observed when organizations with expressive-instrumental or instrumental functions are chosen.

These and other results, when age is controlled, seem to indicate that for the older respondents, powerlessness is more highly associated with organizational participation, compared to the youngest group. The only two organizational aspects studied which seem to be important in understanding the powerlessness of the youngest respondents are (1) current, compared to past, participation (Table 4:2) and (2) the reasons current participation has decreased (Table 4:5).

The data presented regarding leadership in organizations which have expressive or instrumental functions for the respondents gives further evidence on the relevance of the quality of organizational participation and powerlessness. Leaders of expressive organizations in the two youngest age groups are more likely to have low powerlessness than leaders of instrumental groups. In the oldest group, leaders of expressive organizations are more likely to have high powerlessness, while leaders of instrumental organizations are equally likely to have high or low powerlessness.

When the type of organization in which participation has decreased is considered, the results are consistent with the above findings of the suggested relationship between powerlessness and expressive participation.

A larger percentage of those interested in joining expressive organizations have low powerlessness than occurs for those interested in joining instrumental organizations. But when age is controlled, this relationship holds only for the two oldest groups.

Perhaps the factor of "cross-pressures" is relevant to the finding that respondents with expressive, but not instrumental, participation have powerlessness scores which are negatively related. Research related to "cross-pressures" has been concerned with voting. That is, when there are conflicting predisposing factors of religious affiliation, economic status and place of residence, voting may be delayed or avoided.[9] Perhaps this phenomenon can be applied to explain the lack of association between instrumental participation and powerlessness. If there were conflicting predisposing factors to attitudes about being able to effect social changes, an individual might avoid contact with groups which focused on social problems, or not be susceptible to socialization if a member of an organization with instrumental functions.

Again the possibility should be noted that the immediate personal satisfactions of a higher degree of expressive participation might explain the preponderance of low powerlessness found.

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout Chapters III and IV, suggestions were made about control factors which might affect relationships shown. Two other important factors should be mentionned here which have been shown to be relevant to powerlessness and which should be considered in future studies. These factors are mobility orientation and knowledge. Mobility orientation might be important in understanding powerlessness,

since independent of organizational participation, it is possible that "...those who do not strive for success and whose achievement needs are low perceive the world as basically determined and unmanageable..."[7]

Learning might also be related to powerlessness, independent of organizational participation because of findings that "...the individual learns less from his experience in the situation that is conceived to be chance-controlled."[8] This factor might be relevant in understanding the high powerlessness of participants in expressive or instrumental organizations. That is, perhaps because of their low expectancies of being able to control social events, they do not become "socialized" in regard to learning about channels to exert power which presumably would be available through contacts with other members and leaders.

While most of the hypotheses have been rejected, the various measures of organizational participation have been found to have the predicted relationships for some groups of respondents. The evidence seems to confirm the previously-noted mediation of organizational participation between the individual and the larger society.

If organizational participation is thought of as a necessary precondition to the free development of individual potential, as it is in the theory of mass society, the large numbers of low organizational participants may be a matter of some concern. However, the results obtained here indicate that many low participants feel able to control social events. Since these individuals are presumably open to learning about the possibilities for exercising power through various channels, including organizations, these findings indicate that these respondents, too, might be drawn into full, self-determining activities.

The findings that expressive, but not instrumental, organizational participation is related to powerlessness also have significance for the theory of mass society which advocates multiple and diverse organizational memberships. These findings suggest that participation in some, but not all, types of organizations is related to the individual's perception of being a powerful agent in society. Perhaps future research should investigate further this aspect of the results.

FOOTNOTES

1. It has been indicated in Chapter II that all of the items on the powerlessness scale had significantly different percentages of high responses for the highest and lowest quartiles of the distribution of powerlessness scores. This gives some indication that people who differ in the total score for powerlessness show consistent differences in the ways the scale items are answered.

2. See p. 20.

3. Dwight G. Dean, "Powerlessness and Political Apathy," Social Science, XL (October, 1965), p. 212.

4. David Riesman and Nathan Glazer, "Criteria for Political Apathy," in Alvin W. Gouldner, (ed.), Studies in Leadership (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 532, quoted in ibid., p. 213.

5. Ibid.

6. This possibility has been noted also by Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," op. cit., p. 757; and Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation and Political Apathy," Social Forces, XXXVIII (March, 1960), p. 189.

7. Neal and Seeman, op. cit., p. 217.

8. Seeman, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge," op. cit., p. 355.

9. Dean, "Alienation and Political Apathy," op. cit., p. 187.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Blalock, H.M., Jr. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Campbell, A., Gurin, G., and Miller, W. The Voter Decides. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1954.

Chapin, F.S. Experimental Designs in Sociological Research. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1955.

Edwards, A.L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Hausknecht, M. The Joiners. New York: Bedminster Press, 1962.

Kendall, M.G. Rank Correlation Methods. third edition; London: Charles Griffin and Company Limited, 1962.

Kornhauser, W. The Politics of Mass Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.

Nisbet, R.A. Community and Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Becker, E. "Mills' Social Psychology and the Great Historical Convergence on the Problem of Alienation," in I. Horowitz, ed., The New Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964, pp. 108-133.

Beers, H.W. and Heflin, C. "The Urban Status of Rural Migrants," Social Forces, XXIII, No. 1, 1944, pp. 32-37.

Bell, W. "Anomie, Social Isolation and the Class Structure," Sociometry, XX, No. 2, 1957, pp. 105-116.

Blishen, B.R. "The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXIV, No. 4, 1958, pp. 519-531.

_____ "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, IV, No. 1, 1967, pp. 41-53.

Chapin, F.S. "Social Participation and Social Intelligence," American Sociological Review, IV, No. 2, 1939, pp. 157-166.

Clark, J.P. "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," American Sociological Review, XXIV, No. 6, 1959, pp. 849-852.

Clinard, M.B. "The Theoretical Implications of Anomie and Deviant Behaviour," in M.B. Clinard, ed., Anomie and Deviant Behaviour. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, pp. 1-56.

Dean, D.G. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXVI, No. 5, 1961, pp. 753-758.

_____ "Alienation and Political Apathy," Social Forces, XXXVIII, No. 3, 1960, pp. 185-189.

_____ "Powerlessness and Political Apathy," Social Science, XL, No. 4, 1965, pp. 208-213.

Erbe, W. "Social Involvement and Political Activity: A Replication and Elaboration," American Sociological Review, XXIX, No. 2, 1964, pp. 198-215.

Gordon, C.W. and Babchuk, N. "A Typology of Voluntary Association," American Sociological Review, XXIV, No. 1, 1959, pp. 22-29.

Greene, M. "Alienation within a Problematic of Substance and Subject," Social Research, XXXIII, No. 3, 1966, pp. 355-374.

Horowitz, I.L. "On Alienation and the Social Order," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, XXVII, No. 2, 1966, pp. 230-237.

Horton, J.E. "The Dehumanization of Anomie and Alienation," British Journal of Sociology, XV, No. 4, 1964, pp. 283-300.

Jacoby, A.P. "Some Correlates of Instrumental and Expressive Orientations to Associational Membership," Sociological Inquiry, XXXV, No. 2, 1965, pp. 163-175.

_____ and Babchuk, N. "Instrumental and Expressive Voluntary Association," Sociology and Social Research, XLVII, No. 4, 1963, pp. 461-471.

Kaufman, A. "On Alienation," Inquiry, VIII, No. 2, 1965, pp. 141-165.

Meier, D. and Bell, W. "Anomia and Differential Access to Life Goals," American Sociological Review, XXIV, No. 2, 1959, pp. 189-202.

Middleton, R. "Alienation, Race and Education," American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 6, 1963, pp. 973-977.

Mizruchi, E. "Alienation and Anomie: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives," in I. Horowitz, ed., The New Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964, pp. 253-267.

_____ "Social Structure and Anomia in a Small City," American Sociological Review, XXV, No. 5, 1960, pp. 645-654.

Neal, A. and Rettig, S. "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers," American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 4, 1963, pp. 599-608.

_____ "On the Multidimensionality of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXXIII, No. 1, 1967, pp. 54-64.

Neal, A.G. and Seeman, M. "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, XXIX, No. 2, 1964, pp. 216-226.

Nettler, G. "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXII, No. 6, 1957, pp. 670-677.

Nichols, R.C. and Meyer, M.A. "Timing Postcard Follow-Ups in Mail Questionnaire Surveys," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXX, No. 2, 1966, pp. 306-307.

Oiserman, T.I. "Alienation and the Individual," in H. Aptheker, ed., Marxism and Alienation. New York: Humanities Press, 1965, pp. 143-151.

Pineo, P. and Porter, J. "Occupational Prestige in Canada," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, IV, No. 1, 1967, pp. 24-40.

Quinney, R. "Political Conservatism, Alienation, and Fatalism: Contingencies of Social Status and Religious Fundamentalism," Sociometry, XXVII, No. 3, 1964, pp. 372-381.

Rose, A.M. "Alienation and Participation: A Comparison of Group Leaders and the 'Mass'," American Sociological Review, XXVII, No. 6, 1962, pp. 834-838.

Scott, J.C., Jr. "Membership and Participation in Voluntary Associations," American Sociological Review, XXII, No. 3, 1957, pp. 315-326.

Seeman, M. "Alienation, Membership and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXX, No. 3, 1966, pp. 353-367.

_____ "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, XXIV, No. 6, 1959, pp. 783-791.

Seeman, M. "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning," Sociometry, XXX, No. 2, 1967, pp. 105-123.

_____ and Evans, J.W. "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting," American Sociological Review, XXVII, No. 6, pp. 772-782.

Srole, L. "Social Integration and Certain Corrollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, XXI, No. 6, 1956, pp. 709-716.

Woodward, J.L. and Roper, E. "Political Activity of American Citizens," in Eulau, H., Eldersveld, S., and Janowitz, M., eds., Political Behaviour. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1956, pp. 133-137.

Wright, C.R. and Hyman, H.H. "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys," American Sociological Review, XXIII, No. 3, 1958, pp. 284-294.

Zimmer, B.G. "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," American Sociological Review, XX, No. 2, 1955, pp. 218-224.

_____ and Hawley, A. "The Significance of Membership in Associations," American Journal of Sociology, LXV, No. 2, 1959, pp. 196-201.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

Costner, H. "Statistical Inference," Seattle: Department of Sociology, University of Washington.

Henry, F.J. "Programme CRSTAB," Hamilton, Ontario: Department of Sociology, McMaster University.

APPENDIX I

Table I:1 - Sex, Marital Status, Education and Sample Group
(Percentage Distribution)

Group	Sex			Marital Status			Education			
	Male	Female	Total	Single and other	Married	Total	0 - 9	10 - 12	13 and over	Total
Church	56	43	49	18	64	49	47	56	37	49
Union	44	57	51	82	36	51	53	44	63	51
Total N	86	91	177	56	121	177	51	78	46	175
	SP = -.13, Z = 1.72*			SP = -.43, Z = -5.65*			SP = .07, Z = .90			

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table I:2 - Age, Birthplace and Sample Group
(Percentage Distribution)

Group	Age					Birthplace		
	21-25	26-39	40-59	60 and over	Total	Canada	Not Canada	Total
Church	38	60	47	50	49	57	37	49
Union	62	40	53	50	51	43	63	51
Total N	26	42	89	20	177	109	68	177
	SP = 0, Z of SP = 0					SP = .20, Z of SP = 2.60*		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table I:3 - Length of Residence in Canada of Foreign-born, Length of Residence in County and Sample Group (Percentage Distribution)

Group	Length of Residence in Canada of Foreign-born			Length of Residence in County			
	0-10 years	11 years and over	Total	0-10 years	11 years and over	Native	Total
Church	38	36	47	47	48	49	49
Union	62	64	53	53	52	51	51
Total N	13	55	68	32	48	95	175
	SP = .02, Z of SP = .14			SP = -.02, Z of SP = -.27			

Table I:4 - Employment Status, Occupational Class and Sample Group (Percentage Distribution)

Group	Employment Status			Occupational Class			
	Employed	Other	Total	Class I	Class II	Class III	Total
Church	41	96	49	54	47	51	49
Union	59	4	51	46	53	49	51
Total	150	26	176	24	114	37	175
	SP = -.39, Z of SP = -5.15*			SP = .01, Z of SP = .08			

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table I:5 - Political Participation and Sample Group (Percentage Distribution)

Group	Political Participation Low	High	Total
Church	51	47	49
Union	49	53	51
Total N	95	79	174

SP = .04, Z of SP = .48

APPENDIX II

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA

September 15,1967

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a graduate student in Sociology at the University of Alberta conducting a study with the assistance of the Sociology Department at McMaster University. I want to find out how belonging to groups and organizations helps the individual to face the problems of our society.

The information you provide, and that given by other people in your church and community, will be important in learning about community participation and attitudes in Canada. Your name will never be attached to any report of the findings. Rev. Hudson Hilsden of the Bethel Gospel Tabernacle has assisted in this study by giving me your name and address.

Your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me will be greatly appreciated. It is very important to get responses from everyone chosen to take part in the study (even those who don't like to fill out questionnaires!). Your answers will be completely confidential. Only statistical results will be used in the research report.

Thank you for your cooperation.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA

September 15, 1967

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a graduate student in Sociology at the University of Alberta conducting a study, with the assistance of the Sociology Department at McMaster University. I want to find out how belonging to groups and organizations helps the individual to face the problems of our society.

The information you provide, and that given by other people in your union and community, will be important in learning about community participation and attitudes in Canada. Your name will never be attached to any report of the findings. Mr. McIntee of the Canadian Union of Public Employees and Mr. Dixon of the Personnel Department of the Hamilton Civic Hospitals have allowed me to use your union in my study.

Your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me will be greatly appreciated. It is very important to get responses from everyone chosen to take part in the study (even those who don't like to fill out questionnaires!). Your answers will be completely confidential. Only statistical results will be used in the research report.

Thank you for your cooperation.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND OPINION SURVEY*

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Please circle or check the number opposite your reply.

1. Are you a:
   1...Male
   2...Female

2. Are you:
   1...Single 4...Divorced
   2...Married 5...Separated
   3...Widowed

3. What was your age on your last birthday?
   1...Under 21 years 5...40 - 49 years
   2...21 - 25 years 6...50 - 59 years
   3...26 - 29 years 7...60 - 64 years
   4...30 - 39 years 8...65 years and over

4. Where were you born?
   1...Born in Canada
   2...Born outside of Canada

4.1. If you were born outside of Canada, how long have you lived in Canada?
   1...Less than 2 years 4...11- 19 years
   2...2 - 5 years 5...20 years and over
   3...6 - 10 years

5. How long have you lived in your present county of residence? (Please circle the single correct reply.)
   1...Native 4...6 - 10 years
   2...Less than 2 years 5...11 - 19 years
   3...2 - 5 years 6...20 years and over

6. How many years of school have you completed?
   1...Less than 7 years 4...13 - 15 years
   2...7 - 9 years 5...16 or more years
   3...10 - 12 years

7. What is your employment status? (Please circle the number opposite your reply and fill in the information requested.)
   1...Employed...What is your present occupation?
   2...Unemployed (looking for work)...What was your last main occupation?
   3...Disabled...What was your last main occupation?
   4...Housewife
   5...Other (please specify)

---

*The questionnaire was printed on 8½" by 14" paper. The spacing has been modified here.

8. For which company or institution do (did) you work?

9. IF YOU ARE (OR WERE) A MARRIED WOMAN, what is (was) the occupation of your husband?

9.1. For which company or institution does (did) your husband work?

OPINION QUESTIONS: In the following section, please indicate whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with each statement. (Please circle the appropriate number.)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10. I think we have adequate means for preventing run-away inflation.	1	2	3	4
11. Persons like myself have little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.	1	2	3	4
12. A lasting world peace can be achieved by those of us who work toward it.	1	2	3	4
13. There's very little persons like myself can do to improve world opinion of Canada.	1	2	3	4
14. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the average citizen can do about it.	1	2	3	4
15. People like me can change the course of world events if we make ourselves heard.	1	2	3	4
16. I feel helpless in the face of what's happening in the world today.	1	2	3	4
17. Wars between countries seem inevitable despite the efforts of men to prevent them.	1	2	3	4
18. By studying the world situation, one can greatly increase his political effectiveness.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19. The international situation is so complex that it just confuses a person to think about it.	1	2	3	4
20. There's little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.	1	2	3	4
21. Those who do not vote are largely responsible for bad government.	1	2	3	4
22. There's very little we can do to keep prices from going higher.	1	2	3	4
23. I feel that we have adequate ways of coping with strong pressure groups.	1	2	3	4
24. There's very little we can do to bring about a permanent world peace.	1	2	3	4
25. I think each of us can do a great deal to improve world opinion of Canada.	1	2	3	4
26. The average citizen can have an influence on government decisions.	1	2	3	4
27. It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens in society at large.	1	2	3	4
28. I sometimes feel personally responsible for the state of affairs in our government.	1	2	3	4
29. Wars between countries can be avoided.	1	2	3	4
30. Whether one likes it or not, chance plays an awfully large part in world events.	1	2	3	4
31. Active discussion of politics can eventually lead to a better world.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
32. Writing to public officials is a good way to get things done in the government which will help the average person.	1	2	3	4
33. There's little use for me to vote, since one vote doesn't count very much anyway.	1	2	3	4

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

34. On pages 4 and 5, please list the organizations in which you are a member or attend meetings at the present time. Indicate how often you attend, whether you make financial contributions, are a committee member, hold an office, length of membership and reason(s) for participation FOR EACH ORGANIZATION.

Names of Organizations in which you are a member or attend meetings	1.How often do you attend?(Check one)			2.Do you give anything besides dues? (Write "yes" or "no")	3.Are you now a leader in services or meetings or a member of a committee?(Write "yes" or "no")	4.Do you hold an office now?(Write "yes" or "no")	5.How many years have you been a member or attended meetings?	6.Main reason(s) you participate
	Never	Sometimes	Almost always					

A. POLITICAL, MILITARY, AND PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS (such as Liberal Party, Canadian Legion)

B. CHURCH, AND RELIGIOUS- AND CHURCH-AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS (such as Women's Auxiliary, Church Choir, United Church)

C. BUSINESS, CIVIC, SERVICE, IMPROVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS (such as Chamber of Commerce, Community League, Charities)

D. SOCIABLE AND FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS (such as Country Club, Sewing Club, Masons) AND ATHLETIC AND HOBBY ORGANIZATIONS (such as Flying Club, Music Society, Curling Club)

E. PROFESSIONAL OR SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS (such as Bar Association, Medical Association)

F. CO-OPERATIVE, PROTECTIVE, MUTUAL BENEFIT ORGANIZATIONS (such as Memorial Society, Loan Association)

G. LABOR OR TRADE UNION (such as Federation of Labor, Retail Clerk's Union, Machinists Union)

H. OTHER TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS NOT LISTED ABOVE

35. Of the organizations, including churches, you listed above, which one is most important to you?

35.1. Please indicate (in greater detail than was possible in Question 34) the main reason(s) that this organization is important to you. Please explain as fully as possible.

36. To the best of your recollection, which one of the following statements is most correct about your participation in all organizations in the past ten years? (Circle the number opposite your reply.)

1...At present, I participate <u>more</u> than I did in the past.

2...At present, I participate <u>less</u> than I did in previous years.

3...At present, I participate about <u>as much</u> as in the past.

IF YOU CIRCLED NUMBER 2 ("participate less") IN THE ABOVE QUESTION, ANSWER QUESTION 37; OTHERWISE SKIP TO QUESTION 38.

37. Please give the name(s) of the organization(s) in which your participation declined and, in the space provided, check the main reason(s) for this decline. Also, please indicate the main reason(s) for your participation in the first place.

Name of Organization	Illness, Moved Out of Area, Lack of Time Due to Work	Dissatisfaction with Organization (Please explain)	Other (Please Specify)	Main Reason(s) for Your Participation in the First Place
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				

38. Are you seriously considering joining some additional organization(s)? (Please circle the number opposite your reply.)
1...Yes
2...No

IF YOU CIRCLED NUMBER 1 ("yes") IN THE QUESTION ABOVE, ANSWER QUESTION 39; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO QUESTION 40.

39. For each kind of organization listed below, please indicate with a check mark in the appropriate column whether or not you are considering joining it and the reasons you are interested.

Check one for each organization	Yes, I am interested in joining this type of organization	No, I am not interested
1. Political Party	Why?	
2. Church, and Religious- and Church-Affiliated Organizations	Why?	
3. Military or Patriotic Organizations	Why?	
4. Business, Civic, Service or Improvement Organizations	Why?	
5. Sociable Organizations	Why?	
6. Fraternal Organizations	Why?	
7. Professional or Scientific Organizations	Why?	
8. Co-operative, Protective, or Mutual Benefit Organizations	Why?	
9. Labor or Trade Union	Why?	
10. Other (Please specify)	Why?	

40. Are you considering dropping out of some of the organizations to which you belong or decreasing your participation in any of them? (Please circle the number opposite your reply.)
1...Yes
2...No

IF YOU CIRCLED NUMBER 1 ("yes") IN THE QUESTION ABOVE, ANSWER QUESTION 41; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO QUESTION 42.
41. Of the organization which you listed in Question 34, which would you most likely drop? Why?

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES: Finally, please circle the number opposite your reply to the following questions.

42. When you get together with your friends would you say that you discuss public issues like government regulation of business, labor unions, taxes, and farm programs frequently, occasionally, or never?
1...Frequently 2...Occasionally 3...Never

43. If you answered "frequently" or "occasionally" to the question above, which of the following statments best describes the part you yourself take in these discussions with your friends?
1...Even though I have my own opinions, I usually just listen.
2...Mostly I listen, but once in a while I express my opinion.
3...I take an equal share in the conversation.
4...I do more than just hold up my end in the conversation; I usually try to convince others that I am right.

44. Have you written or talked to your Member of Parliament or other public officials in the last four years to let them know what you would like them to do on a public issue you were interested in?
1...No
2...Yes, on one issue only
3...Yes, on two or more issues

45. In the last four years have you worked for the election of any political candidate by doing things like distributing circulars or leaflet, making speeches, or calling on voters?
1...No
2...Yes

46. Have you attended any meetings in the last four years at which political speeches were made?
1...No
2...Yes

47. In the last four years have you contributed money to a political party or to a candidate for a political office?
    1...No
    2...Yes

48. To the best of your recollection, about how many times do you think you have gone to the polls and voted during the last four years?
    1...None
    2...Once or twice
    3...Three to five times
    4...Six or more times

49. Have you written one or more "letters to the editor" to newspapers, magazines or professional journals in the past four years?
    1...No
    2...Yes

50. Have you participated in a public march, protest or demonstration in the last four years?
    1...No
    2...Yes

THANK YOU

Third-Day Reminder Card

Dear Sir or Madam:

A couple of days ago I sent you a questionnaire as part of my Community Participation and Opinion Survey. If you have already returned the questionnaire please consider this a special "thank you" for your promptness. If, as I often do myself, you have put the questionnaire aside to finish later, please fill it out and return it right away. There will probably never be a better time than now.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Kara Lynn Klarner

Sixteenth-Day Reminder Card

Dear Sir or Madam:

I have not yet received the research questionnaire which I sent you a few weeks ago. Since I would like to start studying the results, I hope you will be able to return the questionnaire soon. I realize that this is a busy time of the year, and will appreciate very much your assistance in completing the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Kara Lynn Klarner

Letter Requesting Added Information

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you very much for returning the questionnaire which I sent you. The questionnaire is very carefully and fully completed except for the sections which I have enclosed. I assume that these were skipped accidentally, so I am returning them to you, hoping that you will complete them also and return them to me soon.

Added comments (if any):

I again express my appreciation for your help.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Kara Lynn Klarner

APPENDIX III

Table III:1 - Powerlessness and Political Participation (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Political Participation High	Low	Total
High	44	54	49
Low	56	46	51
Total N	79	95	174
	SP = -.09, Z of SP = -1.23		

Table III:2 - Powerlessness and Political Participation, by Age (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Political Participation High	Low	Total
	21-29 years old		
High	9	48	38
Low	91	52	63
Total N	11	29	40
	SP = -.36, Z of SP = -2.26*		
	30-49 years old		
High	40	41	41
Low	60	59	59
Total N	42	37	79
	SP = 0, Z of SP = -.01		
	50 years old and over		
High	65	76	71
Low	35	24	29
Total N	26	29	55
	SP = -.12, Z of SP = -.85		

*Significant at the .05 level for a one-tailed test

Table III:3 - Powerlessness and Political Participation, by Age and Total Organizational Participation (Percentage Distribution)

Powerlessness	Political Participation: High	Low	Total
21 to 29 years old, low organizational participation			
High	13	50	40
Low	88	50	60
Total N	8	22	30
SP = -.34, Z of SP = -1.82*			
30 to 49 years old, low organizational participation			
High	41	38	39
Low	59	62	61
Total N	27	29	56
SP = .03, Z of SP = .21			
50 years old and over, low organizational participation			
High	68	78	74
Low	32	22	26
Total N	19	27	46
SP = -.10, Z of SP = -.70			
21 to 29 years old, high organizational participation			
High	0	43	30
Low	100	57	70
Total N	3	7	10
SP = -.43, Z of SP = -1.29			
30 to 49 years old, high organizational participation			
High	40	50	43
Low	60	50	57
Total N	15	8	23
SP = -.10, Z of SP = -.45			
50 years old and over, high organizational participation			
High	57	50	56
Low	43	50	44
Total N	7	2	9
SP = .06, Z of SP = .17			

Table III:4 - Powerlessness and Political Participation, by Extensity and Intensity of Organizational Participation (Percentage Distribution)

	Political Participation		
	High	Low	Total
Powerlessness	Low extensity, low intensity		
High	56	62	59
Low	44	38	41
Total N	36	55	91
	SP = -.06, Z of SP = -.59		
	High extensity, low intensity		
High	24	43	35
Low	76	59	65
Total N	17	23	40
	SP = -.21, Z of SP = -1.29		
	Low extensity, high intensity		
High	25	50	33
Low	75	50	67
Total N	4	2	6
	SP = -.25, Z of SP = -.56		
	High extensity, high intensity		
High	45	40	43
Low	55	60	57
Total N	22	15	37
	SP = .05, Z of SP = .32		

Table III:5 - Powerlessness and Political Participation, by Expressive and Instrumental Organizational Participation (Percentage Distribution)

	Political Participation		
	High	Low	Total
Powerlessness	Low expressive, low instrumental		
High	59	60	60
Low	41	40	40
Total N	29	43	72
	SP = -.02, Z of SP = -.16		
	High expressive, low instrumental		
High	31	45	37
Low	69	55	63
Total N	16	11	27
	SP = -.14, Z of SP = -.74		
	Low expressive, high instrumental		
High	56	46	50
Low	44	54	50
Total N	18	26	44
	SP = .09, Z of SP = .61		
	High expressive, high instrumental		
High	20	100	33
Low	80	0	67
Total N	5	1	6
	SP = -.63, Z of SP = -1.41		